DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 237 HE 009 498

AUTHOR	Roueche, John E.; Roueche, Suanne D.
TITLE	Developmental Education: A Primer for Program Development and Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	103p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Bibliographies; Community Colleges; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Developmental Programs; *Educational Disadvantagement; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Measurement Instruments; Nontraditional Students; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

Addressed in this book is the problem encountered by institutions as more students have entered colleges without adequate preparation in the basic subject areas--communications, mathematics, and science. To accommodate the diversity in the new student populations, varying instructional methods are required. Developmental education programs need therefore to be measured for quality and effectiveness. Aspects of program development to be considered are: an overview of developmental studies programs; institutional commitment; program design components; staffing; and consolidating all the elements. Program evaluation takes into consideration the essential data and personnel, and the development of an evaluation design for developmental education. A survey instrument for program evaluation is included, along with a four-page bibliography. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

A PRIMER FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

John E. Roueche and Suanne D. Roueche

ED148237

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. JC

HE009498

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SREB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

A PRIMER FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

John E. Roueche and Suanne D. Roueche

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313
1977
$2.00

3

FOREWORD

Over the last two decades a great number of students have come to campuses without adequate preparation in the basic subject areas — communications, mathematics, and science. In an effort to enhance these students' potential for success in higher education, many colleges and universities, ranging from the small and little known to the large and prestigious, have implemented, in some form, developmental education programs.

Many of today's students are not the typical 18- to 24-year-old college students of the past; they include increased minority, part-time and older students. They bring with them a great diversity of learning readiness, motivation and expectations, as well as preparation for the pursuit of college work. To accommodate this diversity, varying instructional methods are required.

As more students lacking in competence in the basic subject areas are admitted to college, interest in developmental education programs is likely to continue. At the same time, administrators and academicians will want to be assured that the results of these programs justify the support they require. Therefore, it can be expected that many institutions will wish to measure the quality and effectiveness of their developmental education programs. It is hoped that this publication will be helpful to those individuals and institutions.

Winfred L. Godwin
President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

		Page
CHAPTER I	DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAMS: AN OVERVIEW	1
	Definition	2
	Need	3
	Rationale	9
	Scope	10
	Assumptions	11
CHAPTER II	INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	14
	Governance and Administration	15
	Faculty, Students and Community	18
CHAPTER III	PROGRAM DESIGN COMPONENTS	20
	Organizational Structure	20
	Choice: Organizational Patterns	23
	Recruitment, Admissions, Diagnosis and Placement	30
	Criteria: Determination of Program and Course Content	37
	Instruction	40
	Support Services	46
CHAPTER IV	STAFFING	53
	Faculty	54
	Counselors	59
	Peer Counselors and Tutors	63
CHAPTER V	KNITTING IT ALL TOGETHER	66

PART II
PROGRAM EVALUATION

CHAPTER VI DATA AND PERSONNEL ESSENTIAL TO PROGRAM EVALUATION 67

Data Utilized 68
Evaluation Participants 71

CHAPTER VII AN EVALUATION DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY 90

PREFACE

Developmental education is now commonplace in American higher education as colleges and universities busily build programs to accommodate not only the "new" students in higher education, but also to remedy the verbal and quantitative deficiencies so often found today among the "best" students graduating from high school.

More and more students are entering college without reading, writing, and math skills needed to enroll, let alone succeed, at the college level. Without developmental courses, these students will either fail or drop out of college. With well-conceptualized programs, many of these same students will not only stay in school, but also will achieve at high levels.

This publication is not intended to be a philosophical approach to the needs of the students with verbal and quantitative skills deficiencies entering college. Rather, it is a "how-to-do-it" document for colleges and universities wishing to implement a successful developmental education program.

The recommendations come not only from recent research and development efforts, but from our combined practical experiences as well. My own involvement with developmental education spans the past decade and includes several national studies on the subject. I have also conducted several research studies on developmental students for the United States Office of Education and the National Institute for Mental Health. Additionally, I have assisted two hundred colleges with the design, implementation, and evaluation of developmental programs. My wife, Suanne, was a founding member of the Developmental Studies faculty at El Centro College (Dallas, Texas) and for a decade directed the Writing Laboratory at El Centro. She has written a book (*Awareness*, John Wiley Publishers) for teaching writing skills to developmental students and has worked with scores of college faculties on the design of effective communications programs.

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the Southern Regional Education Board Advisory Committee on Developmental Education, who assisted the authors with the design and conceptualization of the present volume. Special thanks to Dr. Charles Nash, Director of Special Studies, University System of Georgia; Dr. Jean Hiler, Chairman, Division of Special Studies, Gainesville Junior College, Gainesville, Georgia; and Dr. W. C. Brown, Director of the Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity for the Southern Regional Education Board, who served on the Advisory Committee and whose solid inputs contributed significantly to this document.

I also want to acknowledge the contribution of Jerry J. Snow, Research Associate, The University of Texas at Austin, for his assistance with the evaluation procedure developed in Part II. Special thanks also to the following individuals who contributed ideas and materials incorporated into this work: Dr. Ruby Herd, President, El Centro College, Dallas, Texas; Dr. William Moore, Jr., Professor of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University; Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, St. Petersburg Junior College, Florida; Dr. Stanton Calvert, Director of Community College Programs for the Texas Coordinating Board for Colleges and Universities; Dr. Oscar G. Mink, Dr. Donald T. Rippey, and Dr. L. D. Haskew, all faculty colleagues at the University of Texas.

I also extend special appreciation to Libby Lord who assisted with manuscript preparation. Without the contributions of these friends, this publication would not have been possible.

John E. Roueche
Austin, Texas
May, 1977

PART I
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAMS: AN OVERVIEW

Developmental cannot be characterized by a limited definition of verbal and quantitative skill remediation for the low-achiever. It spans a wider base. It signifies (1) efforts to take a student from where he is to where he wants (needs) to go, and (2) efforts to provide both the academic and the human skills to make that movement.

Traditionally, colleges and universities engaged in "selective service" education — education for those individuals who could meet specified admission standards. The selective sorting process continued into course work, became a "weeding out" process, and resulted in graduation for 50 percent of the original members of any freshman class. As community colleges opened their doors, quite literally, with promises of educational opportunity for all people, individuals representing great diversities in skill areas began to enroll. For those individuals with the greatest skill deficiencies/weaknesses, the open door concept proved to have no basis in fact. The open door, frankly, was revolving; individuals with hopes for a higher educational experience were confronted with traditional services, and ultimately, with poor performance or failure.

Although the proponents of the community colleges insisted that these institutions were predominant forces in democratizing American higher education, critics charged that these colleges were deliberately capitalizing upon the "democracy's college" concept and encouraging all individuals to enter their doors with offers of opportunities — opportunities for all — for meaningful college experiences that they could not, did not, deliver. Moreover, critics challenged the colleges to evaluate their efforts, to "[match] . . . pretensions with performance." (Jennings, 1970, p. 24). They urged the community colleges to support the contention that they were meeting the instructional needs of all the people, that they were offering help — in successful ways — to students who needed the most help (Jennings, 1970).

Many colleges took up the challenge to provide a meaningful education for all people. The Sixties, in these colleges, were characterized by the

institution of programs aimed at "remediating" or "developing" skill deficiencies or weaknesses in entering students. Attempts at program evaluation, however, were poor or, most often, nonexistent. Any evaluation results usually offered discouraging, even dismal, statistics attesting to the relative merits of remedial programs.

The Seventies have seen national studies instituted to observe, with sound investigative techniques, the relative success of these program efforts. The result of most recent observations is evidence that many colleges have indeed undertaken thoughtful, serious implementation of instructional programs designed to increase the success rate of those students for whom success in college, heretofore, was not a realistic expectation. In addition to these encouraging observations is the introduction of a particularly surprising phenomenon — many selective four-year colleges and universities are also beginning efforts to meet the needs of 1) those students for whom the "selective service" admissions requirements traditionally would have been a barrier, and 2) those students for whom the traditional "weeding out" process would be fatal without supplemental skill development. Such efforts have been the hallmark of historically black colleges and universities over the years.

An overview of present instructional trends would indicate sweeping reform in current educational practices. Efforts are appearing in various forms and under various titles to tackle diverse skill needs. The name — almost generic in nature and most often given to these efforts — is *developmental education.* If indeed developmental education is becoming a major component of the larger educational process, the implication is that educators will be called upon to assess the concepts, the design, the implementation, and the evaluation of the programs emerging from these reform efforts. It is, then, that an assessment of developmental education — i.e., programs of developmental studies — is of the first order.

Definition

What is presently termed "developmental" education was initially referred to, most commonly, as "remedial" education. These two terms were, historically, used interchangeably; however, according to some writers, a subtle difference existed. The term *remedial* was used to imply that the student would undergo remediation of his skill deficiencies in order that he might enter a program for which he was previously ineligible. The term *developmental* was used to suggest that a development of skills and attitudes would occur and that this development was not necessarily undertaken to increase a student's eligibility for another program (Roueche, 1968).

However, by the late 1960's and early 1970's, the term *remedial* was assigned questionable and negative connotations. These assignments

resulted from ineffective programs and stigmatizing labels, prejudiced attitudes and absence of credit (Roueche and Snow, 1977). It was, then, that the more popular term became *developmental* — developmental suggesting a strengthening and broadening of skills as opposed to a remedying of narrow sets of skill deficiencies.

Cross (1976) contends that a more useful distinction between what is remedial and what is developmental would be found in the purpose or goal of the program. She suggests that:

> If the purpose of the program is to overcome *academic deficiencies*, I would term the program remedial, in the standard dictionary sense in which remediation is concerned with correcting weaknesses. If, however, the purpose of the program is to develop the diverse talents of students, whether academic or not, I would term the program developmental. Its mission is to give attention to the fullest possible development of talent and to develop strengths as well as to correct weaknesses (Cross, 1976, p. 31).

Developmental cannot be characterized by a limited definition of verbal and quantitative skill remediation for the low-achiever. It spans a wider base. It signifies (1) efforts to take a student from where he is to where he wants (needs) to go, and (2) efforts to provide both the academic and the human skills to make that movement. Its efforts seek to secure and/or to improve, for the student, the skill areas that make his goals potentially successful. It strives to offer viable alternatives for both immediate and long-range success plans. It offers a protected learning environment — one which controls (thus assures) success, encourages self-reliance in the face of difficulty, and gradually introduces strong transitional (coping) skills. But above all, and most importantly, developmental education *assumes* ability and *moves* in all ways possible to maximize it.

Need

An awareness of widespread efforts to define, design and implement programs would presuppose rather serious needs for such efforts to be made. And, indeed, the needs are real. Indications are that a serious problem exists in the educational process preceding the college experience; graduation from high school and good grades do not necessarily indicate competency in even the most basic verbal and quantitative skills. Indications, too, are that important changes in the labor market are narrowing the jobs available to unskilled applicants — old jobs are being eliminated and new ones calling for more certification in performance of job skills are being created. The unskilled, the "new" students, whose aspirations likely never included thoughts of a higher education

experience, are among the diverse population entering colleges and universities. These students are receiving poor scores on college achievement tests which label them "under-achievers" or "high-risk" and place them in remedial or developmental classes. It is the need to meet the skill requirements of this population that underscores the preparation and the improvement of developmental programs.

Skill proficiencies requiring remediation or development at the college level reflect a pervasive problem in American education. A simple, implicit definition or description of the problem may be impossible. However, the problem is this: in effect, more and more students are graduating from high schools each year without the basic skills necessary to survive. As a result of the rapid changes in our technological society, they are simply eliminated from the competition in the job market. These high school graduates not only lack job-related skills as a result of public schooling, many of them are functional illiterates. Functional illiteracy here is described as the inability to either read or write one's own name. Thus, after twelve years of formal education, there are students graduating from American high schools who fit the description of a functional illiterate. Obviously, many of these individuals are from the lower quartile of their classes; however, it would not be unusual to find that these illiterates are students who have proven successful in their public school efforts — in other words, they have achieved good grades, and they have the commendation of their teachers. Is it any wonder then that today courts are filled with parents and taxpayers bringing suits against school districts for failing to teach their children the skills necessary to make it in today's world (television special, "American Schools Are Flunking the Test," American Broadcasting Company, May 27, 1976).

The University of Texas recently conducted a study of adult functional competency in the United States. Results of that study noted that 23 million Americans, or one-fifth of the adult population, had difficulty with such everyday chores as shopping, getting a driver's license, or reading an insurance policy. It was reported that another 39 million Americans expressed their own concerns about role-related skills — skills as workers, consumers, citizens, and parents. A most startling observation of the Texas study was that less than one-half of the adult population, 46 percent is considered proficient in dealing with the complexities of modern living (*Adult Functional Competency*, 1975).

These, then, are some results of the problem. As unbelievable as the problem itself is, the circumstances leading to the problem are even more unbelievable. Students spend more time and more effort in English courses than they do in any other subject required in public education. Our teachers are actively teaching English for twelve years. Yet indications are that verbal skills are deteriorating at an alarming rate. (*Newsweek*, December 8, 1975). And, no one doubts the necessity of good verbal skills

in our culture. The problem, however, is not limited to English and to the development of good verbal skills. Deficiencies are also obvious in basic quantitative and problem-solving skills *(Adult Functional Competency,* 1975). To add to the list of deficiencies, the shortcomings in study skills patterns are also evident. Yet no one would doubt that public school teachers are personally aware of the importance of such habits and espouse to teach them to their students.

In addition to those high school graduates who have skills deficiencies and shortcomings, there is another almost overlooked segment of our society. This segment is made up of millions of Americans who, for whatever reasons peculiar to each of them, decide to drop out of the public school experience. Nationwide data on public school attrition is nonexistent. Statewide or regionwide data, when available, will vary considerably. Two important factors of attrition data are: (1) there is widespread mobility in our society wherein individuals can virtually disappear in even the best of record-keeping situations; (2) schools have never been required, nor in fact, been asked to report on the development occurring in attendance patterns. There are indications now that 30 percent of all first graders in the United States never complete public school. In some Southern states, 50 percent never graduate from high school; 70 percent is the attrition figure recorded for minorities and poor whites in these areas. If high school graduates, as previously cited, are having difficulty coping in today's society and their skills deficiencies set up insurmountable barriers to survival, consider the problem confronted by those Americans who do *not* have a high school education.

The need is real; the problem exists; the students are here. The different terms used to describe these so-called "problem students" refer to either their social, educational, or economic backgrounds or to the category by which the institution receiving them describes their characteristics. Common terms include: "disprivileged," "disadvantaged," nontraditional," and "new." In his most recent study of community college responsiveness to this group of students, Moore elects to use the term "high-risk." He designates this term as one less abused than are many of the others (Moore, 1976). Moore attests to the accurate descriptions that fill the literature about high-risk students. He, too, observes that these students have obvious deficiencies in such skill areas as reading, writing, and math. He, too, observes that they do not have the mechanics of good study habits. He witnesses their unimpressive standardized test scores, their races and their cultures which would place them at a disadvantage when vying for college entrance. Moore is most concerned, however, that "this description of cultural and educational disadvantages has been widely accepted, not as a tentative hypothesis, but as a confirmed explanation of the poor achievement among high-risk students" (Moore, 1976, p. 3).

Cross correctly observes that efforts to create remedial programs in

community colleges during the 1960's were a result of large numbers of minorities entering higher education. She points out, however, that open-door admissions policies did result in the enrollment of overwhelming numbers of low-achievers, but that the majority of these low-achievers were not ethnic minorities. Rather, they were predominantly the white sons and daughters of blue-collar workers (Cross, 1976).

Thus, restated, the problem and the need are with us. The students, however, do not neatly fit into a well-defined pattern or category. They are not limited to the minority or to the disprivileged. Rather, they are found throughout the entire population. A *Newsweek* feature article (December 8, 1975) speaks to the problem and to the population exhibiting the effects of it: "What makes the new illiteracy so dismaying is precisely the fact that writing ability even among the best educated young people seems to have fallen so far so fast." The same article reports that the University of California at Berkeley, boasting students who come only from the top 12.5% of all high school graduates, required nearly half of last year's freshmen to enroll in remedial courses nicknamed "bonehead English" (December 8, 1975, p. 59). This requirement was the result of the demonstration of such poor writing skills that enrollment in regular courses would have been disastrous. Thus, even the most selective universities in the nation are faced with needs heretofore unheard of in their selected students. Their answer is in the development of remedial and developmental courses and programs designed to accommodate these needs and attempt to prepare these students for regular college-level work.

Obviously, the "new" students appear from all levels of socio-economic backgrounds and with all levels of ability. They enroll in postsecondary institutions without regard to the size of the institution, its public or private nature, its open-door or highly-selective admissions. Their needs fall under the auspices of adult basic literacy training courses, and post-secondary institutions conduct much of this literacy training.

"New" students are unlike their traditional student counterparts. Educationally, the "new" student

> has not acquired the verbal, mathematical, and full range of cognitive skills required for collegiate level work. Generally, he is a student whose grades place him in the bottom half of his high school class, who has not earned a (college preparatory) diploma, and is assigned to a high school which has a poor record for student achievement or who has been tracked into a general, commercial, or vocational high school program. . . . Such a student will generally rank low on such traditional measures of collegiate admissions as the SAT Board scores, high school average class standing, or (state) examination (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970).

Although attention has been called to the issue of characterizing

minority students as the low-achieving students in higher education, it would be less than fair to overlook giving some special attention to their problems. Indeed, students from all races and economic settings are leaving school ill-prepared, but the statistics as to the plight of minority youngsters deserves special mention. For example, the 1970 census data show that 21 percent of white persons, ages 16 to 24, had completed at least two years of college and 9 percent had completed four. Blacks of this age span (16 to 24) registered 9 percent completing two years and 3 percent completing four (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970).

Their deficiencies in reading, writing, and arithmetic are not the only problems that these students face. As a result of their prior schooling, they have learned to fail. Their school behavior mirrors this belief in a "failure identity." Because they have experienced little success in school, they have little expectation that they can ever succeed in educational endeavors. Continuing, they also have little expectation of a chance to win outside of school. And the expectation can be considered a real possibility! This phenomenon — poor educational background equalling unsuccessful "real world" experiences — is a rather recent development in America. Heretofore, even within the past twenty years, those individuals not successful or interested in formal schooling could achieve some measure of success in society. The occurrence of this phenomenon is now almost impossible. Presently, those students who don't succeed in school have virtually no options available to them. As a result, more and more of those students who are unsuccessful in the public school experience have opted to enter postsecondary institutions, the issue being that there was nowhere else to go!

If indeed these students perceived they had nowhere else to go but to postsecondary institutions, it would have been conceivable that their options to enroll in public community colleges were good ones. After all, community colleges were espousing egalitarian philosophies and, by law in most states, they were to admit any high school graduate or others who could, so-called, "profit" from instruction. They apparently were welcoming "problem" students into their institutions; however, not necessarily was the welcome generalized to all curriculums. More importantly, they were advertising the creation and development of courses and services designed primarily to meet the needs of those students who had, heretofore, experienced difficulty in the educational environment.

Thus, the efforts to incorporate remedial education programs in the college curriculum became widespread. In 1968, Roueche found that most community colleges had developed courses and/or programs for students with academic deficiencies. The most offered courses were remedial English, remedial reading, and remedial mathematics. But, for the most part, the donations of money, time, space to provide for the learning needs of the increasing numbers of low-achieving students were unsuccessful.

Yet the dichotomy existed — the only available option offered these students but small hope! Until the last two years, the "new" students were able to enroll *only* in the community colleges. The admissions pressures of the 1960's resulted in the denial, to students with learning deficiencies, of admission to the more prestigious four-year colleges (Gordon, 1972; Kendrick, 1965). An example of such admissions patterns is still evident in California. Students graduating in the top 12.5 percent of their high school graduating classes are eligible to attend the University of California; those graduating in the top 33.3 percent of their high school graduating classes may attend any of the California state colleges; everyone else is eligible to attend community colleges. It was in 1973 that Karabel reported that community colleges received one-third of all students entering higher education. And in California, the figure was greater than 80 percent (Karabel, 1973).

In the same vein, Karabel was able to document that low socio-economic status was linked to enrollment in community colleges (Karabel, 1973). But it is now possible to document that changes have occurred in these enrollment patterns. It is apparent, recently, that relationships are unclear between type and incidence of postsecondary enrollment and socio-economic status, ethnicity, prior educational experience and concomitant achievement level. In other words, the problem students are now representative of all society, the relationships that were traditionally in existence are not now so evident. Results of present patterns are that practically every university in the nation is today making an effort to remedy the learning needs of its students. Prestigious universities, including Stanford, Ohio State, and the University of California (Berkeley), are quick to admit that they are filling developmental classes with straight-A students — students who enter their institutions with poor study habits. For example, Stanford has established its own learning assistance center (LAC), a remedial program designed for the bright students (*Time*, 1976). LAC, begun in 1972, now serves more than 50 percent of Stanford's freshmen each year. The most popular class at the center is LAC-10, a three-hour credit course in reading skills for students with reading deficiencies. The LAC program at Stanford is an effort representative of university responses to the "problem."

The fact that four-year colleges and universities are reacting to the "problem" is not indicative of any modification of philosophy or mission statements. Indeed, one cannot generalize from this behavior that, as a rule, they have adopted more egalitarian views of higher education. Rather, many are responding merely to the law of supply and demand. At the present time, there are more vacancies in colleges than there are students wishing to enroll in them. In many states, universities are accepting students today who, just five years ago, would have been denied admission. In fact, some universities are reporting today that

average SAT scores for entering freshmen are 100 to 200 points below those required for enrollment a few years ago.

Rationale

So what statement of rationale might be made for the creation and continuance of developmental programs? With so clear an indication of need, perhaps a clear and simple rationale is appropriate. The student for whom development of skills is a must will either be an asset or a liability to society; he will either receive adequate preparation for his vocation, choose a more viable alternative to his original vocational choice and successfully make his own way, or he will receive insufficient, ineffective skill development and will cost society as a welfare recipient or as a prison inmate.

This either-or predicament is not a totally new one to American society, or the theories for universal education would not continue to be strong ones. However, what postsecondary institutions can do to extend educational opportunities to those who have been ill-served by previous schooling is the subject of numerous questions.

A rationale for developmental education is apparent. For better or for worse, American higher education is now faced with a crucial decision. It may accept the problem and the results of the problem and make some serious attempts to provide, if not solutions, remedies of its own design. Or, American higher education can decide to overlook the problem and the students (the results of the problem), and pretend that skill deficiencies do not exist or that it is not higher education's responsibility to deal with them. The results of the latter decision would obviously be disastrous. The "new" students and the low-achievers are now or soon will be entering college. The last two decades have seen dramatic increases in their enrollment, and whatever the forces at work to bring these numbers to college, they *are* enrolling. They are in hopes that the "education for all" concept is a viable one.

A recent study of colleges and universities providing developmental assistance to students has discovered that programs and persons in developmental areas are making positive impacts on heretofore unsuccessful students (Roueche and Snow, 1977). A primary focus for the achievement of a successful program was cited as being that ability to articulate exactly what the purpose of the developmental program would be. Overall, the purpose appeared to be success. The definitions of success are as varied as the definitions of developmental/remedial education. The primary underlying goal of developmental education must be to allow the student to persist in school; in effect, it is to help the student persist so that he might have the advantages unavailable to him were he outside potential sources of help. The research on student persistence rate is normally reported in terms of improvements in grade point average, high

persistence rate, college transfer successes, and the ability to make the transition from developmental to regular academic work without a loss of academic achievement.

Tinto criticizes intervention programs in higher education and refers to their "complacent programming." He concludes that: "Whatever the diagnosis, the means employed to keep the 'disadvantaged' in college are quite similar from program to program." (Tinto, 1974, p. 39). The latest national study, in contrast to Tinto's findings, uncovered a variety of existing practices — practices espousing quite similar goals. The most recent study observed that few colleges reported a clear sense of purpose guiding their programming efforts. The primary purpose espoused by these institutions was the attempt to remedy a student's academic skill deficiencies and to improve his self-concept.

A statement of philosophy for developmental education places value on the worth of the individual as well as on the importance of promoting his social/economic well-being. It assigns importance to providing useful educational experiences for students in need of skill improvement and assumes responsibility for students' success. It pledges design of programs aimed at meeting individual needs. It places the program in a position that is supportive of institutional objectives, rather than in the position of being an end in itself.

Colleges present a variety of purposes for developmental/remedial education. Some colleges continue to see remedial programs as being custodial in nature (Roueche, 1968). And the philosophy of such custodial efforts seems to suggest no real hope for success and places little importance upon trying. Other remedial programs see their primary function as one of student redirection.

Scope

The scope of developmental programs is both institutional and programmatic in nature. If indeed the institution assumes the responsibility for meeting the needs of low-achieving students, then developmental efforts are institutional in nature. In effect, the program will assume a position of undergirding institutional objectives, and the institution is in position to support these developmental efforts.

Developmental studies programs, to be integral parts of the institution's offerings, must be a consideration of every aspect of the institution's recruitment, placement, evaluation, and follow-up procedures. In other words, if the institution accepts the idea that incoming students are characterized by diverse abilities and deficiencies, then it will not limit the consignment of developmental studies to a narrow set of skills remediation or development or to a select few entering students and, thereby, chance wasting the full impact of positive developmental efforts.

Programmatically, developmental studies can assume a wide scope. In addition to traditional reading/writing/mathematical skill development, enhancement of the student's self-concept has beome popular. Little attention was paid to personal-social skills prior to the 1960's. However, during the Sixties and Seventies, colleges began to pay more attention to personal/social variables which influence intellectual outcomes (Cross, 1976).

Developmental studies programs need not be narrow efforts at reading, writing, mathematics, self-concept development, and grouping but rather they can assume some responsibilities for student population at large. Many colleges have envisioned their developmental studies programs as learning assistance centers, which provide tutorial and staff development functions, assist in the selection of the curriculum and instructional choices of the college at large, and aid in the diagnosis and assessment practices. Many programs seek input and advice from other departments or divisions in the formulation of learning objectives for developmental courses and encourage dialog on the objectives of courses where developmental students enroll after completing their basic courses. Many developmental departments include in their offerings such specific services as (1) mini-courses (from one hour to three weeks duration) in particular skills development, (2) tutoring efforts, (3) preparation for GED examinations, and (4) courses designed to produce effective peer counselors.

Indeed, the scope of developmental programs is broad both programmatically and institutionally. No longer should developmental studies be assigned a narrow role. The need it serves is too great; the students it serves are too many; it mirrors too clearly the role of American higher education to be assigned a narrow focus within the institution.

Assumptions

Currently, there are contrasting assumptions made about developmental studies programs. On the one hand, there are those assumptions that can be labeled debilitating forces; these forces would be ideas encouraging some individuals and institutions to take less than an enthusiastic view of the role of developmental efforts. The other group of assumptions can be called facilitating efforts. These would be efforts supporting a positive view of the ability of developmental studies programs to, in truth, carry out activities which would support and deliver the promises made in a strong rationale statement.

Debilitating forces can be characterized by several of the following assumptions. Perhaps the most debilitating belief of all would be that traditional instruction, traditional curriculum choices, traditional beliefs in the so-called normal curve (as it applies to aptitude and to ability) will

work. Indeed, recent studies are upholding the theory that instruction must be geared to individual needs. Another debilitating assumption could be that a student's past achievement records are a solid indication of his ability to achieve. Perhaps the most debilitating theory of all, in this day and age, would be to assume that there is no place in American higher education for remediation, that those students who do not demonstrate obvious ability to do college work should be siphoned into training or retraining programs outside of institutions of higher education.

Efforts which might be called facilitating are those actions based on beliefs that all students can learn, that they can achieve measurable success in developmental studies programs. Most importantly, these efforts say that American higher education has a role to fill in helping *all* students achieve success. Too, they assume that past educational achievement records are not indicative of an individual's innate ability to learn. They look for methods by which individual learning needs can be met.

Moore indicates several basic premises which he considers of primary importance in creating a developmental studies program. He suggests that developmental studies students not be categorized on the basis of environmental, cultural, socio-economic factors and that the design of the program assumes the presence of students from all levels of the socio-economic and cultural environment. He strongly urges that college-age students are not without hope for remediation; in other words, previous academic performance should not be considered an accurate index to what future performance might be. Those in charge of developmental studies programs, instructors and administrators, should be willing to express and to demonstrate strong belief in the fact that students can learn, that they want to learn, that their individual differences can be met with changes in curricula and in teaching techniques (Moore, *New Directions*, 1976). Positive assumptions about the potential success of developmental studies programs are underscored from recent national surveys which conclude that community colleges and other educational institutions can design and implement successful programs for nontraditional and high-risk students. They are assuming that, indeed, a lack of basic skills will preclude college success, that mastery of these basic skills will enhance the student's potential for college success, and that this mastery can be accomplished given administrative, instructor, and curriculum support. It is apparent that given successful experiences in a controlled environment, positive self-concepts can be generated. Assumptions about the relevancy of offerings in developmental programs are of paramount importance. Students learn best when they attach some value to the work and perceive that there is some payoff — payoff both immediate (most important) and long-range.

The assumptions that both an institution and an instructor make in regard to the design of the program and in regard to the student can

either impede the progress and the success of the program or they can serve as strong program support systems. Assumptions about developmental studies programs should have one primary focus — that students, no matter their diverse needs, can learn. Basic assumptions that educators traditionally have held about ability and achievement in regard to strict time frames and instructional approaches are to be questioned. Unless the assumptions about what can be done to correct, or at least to improve upon, the problem facing higher education are positive and facilitating, an effective reaction to the problem will not exist.

CHAPTER II

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

For any program or effort to be undertaken, an institution must provide support — expressions of its commitment. Recent studies have found that a common factor in all colleges boasting successful developmental studies programs was a strong institutional commitment to the developmental program (Roueche and Kirk, 1973). And in truth, colleges can provide powerful growth-oriented institutional climates for high-risk students.

In a recent study by Roueche and Mink, it was observed that positive growth-oriented climates were dependent on virtually all those who comprised the educational community — trustees, administrators, faculty, and students (Roueche and Mink, 1974). It is, however, the president who literally sets the stage for the orchestration of the variables that produce positive or negative results in the institution. It is the president who is a key figure in the support of the college's efforts to serve high-risk students. It is the president and his key administrators who provide the financial and the staff resources to see that the program continues. Studies have found that campus presidents who had an in-depth awareness of the activities, the objectives, and the designs of these programs were frequently the creators or the originators of such efforts for nontraditional students. One president is known to have observed: "It is absurd to speak about a comprehensive community college with an open-door admissions policy without placing high college priority on the design and development of effective educational programs for all our community college students. We have an obligation to these students and we are going to do more for them than 'keep them off the streets'." (Roueche and Kirk, 1973). Even in selective universities, commitment is needed as greater student diversity is now evidenced.

Institutional commitment to developmental studies programs is evident in both verbal and active pledges of obvious support. Initially, an institution's commitment is reflected in a mission statement. The mission statement, perhaps, is the result of a specific goal-setting effort or a general open door admissions policy that is underscored by a written commitment to provide success-oriented education, no matter the needs of the student population. It could, perhaps, go without saying that written institutional commitments are important. It is obvious that institutional perceptions of high-risk students are significantly related to student achievement. It is, indeed, a definite comment upon the insti-

tution's ability to cause learning and to provide viable alternatives for high-risk students when it makes solid statements about its intention in a mission statement that goes *beyond* a general "open arms" admissions procedure.

This commitment, indeed, is a solid statement of an institution's concern for these students; however, if the verbal acknowledgment of intent is not acted out in very specific kinds of ways, both the individuals (administrative and faculty) within the institution and the students that they serve will be disillusioned. Hence, they will place little value upon the efforts they do observe being implemented. Indeed, the institution must have carefully considered its questions of priorities, and the developmental studies program must be viewed as an effort high on that priority list.

Governance and Administration

Four major groups are involved in any commitment assessment. If the administration shows commitment to the program, its behavior should reflect that support. Administrative behavior, here, is best exemplified (1) by the amount of financial support, (2) by the policy decisions, and (3) by the projected attitudes that it engenders with this support and these decisions.

A major commitment that administration can make is in the financial support it provides a developmental studies program. And in economically trying times, this support is no small matter. There are those who would contend that throwing "good money" into efforts for "bad students" will have no payoff. However, there are those who do not take such a dim view of these efforts, and they are asking questions, too — the most often heard: "Then what is your plan to remedy the problems we are facing?" Initially, an administration must decide to seek out sources of financial aid for both its programs and its students. And if indeed no support is available from outside sources, these institutions are faced with the decision as to whether they will personally take on the remedial efforts. This is commitment of the highest order.

Studies have found that many community colleges are funding programs for high-risk students primarily with available federal sources; however, the colleges most successful with these programs are characterized by a commitment of their own institutional resources to these programs. Those who would criticize remedial programs must have observed that federal curtailment of Title III programs and the Special Services to the Disadvantaged programs would pass the real commitment to the high-risk student. The suggestion is, of course, that many colleges have developmental studies programs only because federal dollars are there and that the colleges' real priorities are elsewhere.

Obviously, federal support, even local support, is dwindling now. The criteria by which funding agencies measure proposals for dollars are becoming more and more stringent. And, thus, the evidence reports that a real dilemma faces higher education. As colleges and universities are being called upon to prepare individuals with skills for meeting employment as well as coping skills to survive in our society, they are also being asked to please teach students in the basic skills of reading and writing. And they are being asked to perform these tasks with reduced revenues and dwindling public support.

A feature article in the *New York Times* informs us that the Ohio Board of Regents has refused to reimburse state colleges and universities for their remedial programs. The basis for their argument is the belief that taxpayers should not be charged a second time for something that they have already paid the public schools to accomplish (*New York Times*, March 7, 1976). A recent survey, however, discovered that Ohio State University operates 350 sections of remedial freshman English at a cost of $500,000. That cost must be charged to other funded areas since the Regents will not fund these catch-up courses. If the question is one of institutional financial support, and that support is translated into sizable sums of money, a real commitment is obvious; the institution's administration presumes that a solid service to the student population will be performed through the continuance of developmental studies programs. Indeed, one could not overlook the payoff for enlarging both the potential enrollment and the potential re-enrollment of students. If, indeed, the revenue gained from enrollment cannot (as a result of increased costs of higher education) be weighted heavily, one should remember that the return of that person's contribution to society — as opposed to his "draws" upon society — should be considered.

Administrative commitment to developmental studies programs is seen also in policy decisions — policy decisions about grading practices, timing or scheduling of classes, allotment of space to the program, hiring practices, registration procedures, and credit involved in developmental courses. The decisions should be characterized by flexibility in timing and scheduling of courses as well as flexibility in the designation of completion times. Decisions about the time allowance for completion of courses obviously must interface with a grading system that will allow for the inability to meet traditional time frames of semester-length courses.

When decisions as to the physical placement of developmental studies programs within the institution are made, serious regard should be given to one particular phenomenon: the importance that is generally ascribed to a function when it is centrally located — physically accessible — within the institution and conforms to the general decor of the institution. For example, many instructors of technical-vocational courses have complained loudly that their classes would assume more importance in stu-

dents' thinking if they were physically placed and housed in more impressive surroundings. They were concerned that the image of technical-vocational courses was being damaged when such courses were being taught in barrack-looking buildings situated away from the main campus or in the older sections of the campus buildings. And they were right! Developmental instructors complain that makeshift, temporary surroundings or isolated groups of classrooms do not make for positive feelings about the efforts being made there.

Developmental hiring decisions are particularly important, as studies are pointing out the tremendous effects that developmental studies instructors have upon their students. If, as the studies suggest, the instructor is the key to the success or failure of the program, administrators should not make light of the immense task involved in hiring individuals who would best meet strong criteria of specific developmental faculty characteristics. These characteristics are discussed in a later section.

Recognizing the importance of first impressions, particularly as regards the high-risk student, policy decisions should set forth strong efforts to make the recruitment and registration procedures as simple and straightforward as possible. Typical registration barriers should be investigated, and steps should be undertaken to make the registration process as painless a procedure as possible. Many institutions have taken great pains to offer more personal registration by presenting to smaller groups an orientation session followed by on-the-spot registration — all done as an activity occurring before the general registration dates. Others have sent potential students alternative counseling dates, asked for response, and followed up on no-response or no-show situations. Various attempts at "hand-holding" registration are being implemented, and they are to be commended for helping students make solid first decisions and for helping convince them that their idea to enter college was a good one.

Perhaps the greatest controversy to arise from recent decisions about developmental studies programs would have to do with the granting of credit for these courses. Historically, remedial courses were non-credit courses, and students protested spending time in a course for which no credit was allowed. It is understandable that students would expect some return for their time, money, and effort. If indeed the institution was not willing to provide credit, no wonder that students would assign either to themselves or to the institution little value to these courses. The trend now is to introduce general studies courses with full credit (Monroe, p. 123). In fact, an institution's attitude toward learning which takes place in developmental courses can largely be assessed by asking one basic question: "Are your developmental courses awarded institutional credit?" In summarizing what research indicates for developmental educators, Cross (1976) arrived at the same conclusion. She reported:

> ...The major "reward" that education has to offer these students is college credit. Ultimately, all students may come to appreciate the personal satisfaction of learning; until then, new students, more than other students, need the immediate and tangible reward of credit.
>
> ...While college credit for below college-level work may threaten institutional egos, it should not threaten the egos of "educators" whose task it is to help students learn. In any event the trend is toward credit and most of the recent literature advocates granting credit for remedial or developmental courses. In 1970, less than one-third of the community colleges were granting degree credit for remedial courses; by 1974, 53 percent were granting degree and 32 percent were granting non-degree credit (Cross, 1976, p. 44).

Through these administrative decisions, the possibility that the developmental program will be successful is strengthened. It is the result of the projection of these positive attitudes toward developmental studies programs that characterize much-publicized successful programs. Indeed, a strong consideration is that "administrative leadership may well be the most important factor in the design of programs for nontraditional students" (Roueche and Kirk, 1973, p. 75).

Faculty, Students and Community

Strong leadership toward developmental studies on the part of the administrative team will naturally be reflected in the attitudes of the faculty, the students, and the community-at-large. Those individuals who are the faculty members of developmental studies programs are characteristically described, in the literature, as working out of a basic belief in the worth of the individual. They believe in the student's ability to find an acceptable level of success for himself, and they have a commitment to share in the responsibility for that student's success. Generally, studies are discovering that faculty members of these programs are members of those departments or divisions by choice; in other words, they elect to teach those courses. They take upon themselves the efforts to interface with faculty members-at-large in an effort to get a clear picture of those requirements of college course work and the attitudes of the faculty toward developmental studies students and programs. They work toward faculty cooperation generally as they seek the support of these other professionals.

Students, in particular, are those for whom institutional commitment on an administrative and a faculty level are most important. They are quick to perceive dishonesty and imbalance between stated missions and actual behaviors. They are quick to recognize faculty members who do not accept the basic premise that developmental students can be success-

ful; they are quick to recognize when a program's placement in a physical arrangement is less than complimentary; they expect some compensation or some reward for their time, effort and money. As a result, a student's commitment of the program can be best attained when she/he honestly feels that a serious regard is evident for her/his well-being. This regard is evident as instructors and administration make policies and plan curriculum in such a way that the student sees payoff; she/he envisions some control over both course work and completion time frame. The student is quick to sense that attempts beyond the standard traditional ones are being implemented in efforts to reach her/him, at whatever level.

The community-at-large makes a commitment to developmental education when indeed it financially and philosophically supports an institution and its developmental programs. Its commitment can be most effectively achieved when the institution implements sound evaluation techniques and disseminates the data from those evaluative efforts. Obviously, strong commitment would come upon the heels of much good feedback (student success), and the sharing of this feedback would go far in the attainment of community support.

In summary, institutional commitment is no slight effort, nor is it of little importance. Indeed, many of those long-term developmental educators and administrators would place this undergirding at the top of the "must" list for a successful developmental studies program. Institutional priorities are obvious. One need only visit a college campus for a few hours to perceive, to grasp, the ideas about those programs and those areas of the institution of which the administration is most proud and on which it places the greatest importance. It is, then, that great responsibility for the success or failure of developmental studies programs rests with those who would first make the decision to realistically provide efforts to fulfill the commitments made by the open door policies.

CHAPTER III

PROGRAM DESIGN — COMPONENTS

Poor academic achievement, as recorded in the literature, is assumed to stem from at least five perceived causes. These causes are: poor study habits, inadequate mastery of basic academic skills, low academic ability or low IQ, psychological-motivational blocks to learning, and socio-cultural factors relating to deprived family and school backgrounds (Cross, 1976). Cross senses that historical trends in diagnoses of low academic achievement appear to be additive. In other words, she observes that students growing up in socio-cultural settings which are basically opposed to school achievement are likely to have problems with a wide range of skills, including some human skills. As a result of the diversity and the integration of so many skill weaknesses, there are few courses today that can be singled out as *how-to* courses. The trend, therefore, is "toward remediation or developmental efforts embedded in a total *program* that includes cognitive, social, and emotional components" (Cross, 1976, p. 27).

Organizational Structure

Developmental/remedial efforts reflect a continuum of organizational structures — from the isolated teacher, counselor, or director working on a particular course or program to an integrated team of specialists offering complete services within a division or department. According to a recent national survey on developmental studies programs, three major plans for developmental studies programs are evident (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Those programs falling in a fourth category named "other" were observed. The distribution of today's colleges on this continuum is as follows:

1. The addition of *isolated developmental courses* in disciplined curricula; that is, adding developmental reading to the list of approved courses in English.
Community colleges = 34%; senior colleges = 32%.

2. Working with an *interdisciplinary group of instructors* who remain attached to their disciplines organizationally, and who coordinate with instructors from other disciplines and with counselors assigned to compensatory students.
Community colleges = 18%; senior colleges = 11%.

3. Establishment of a *division or department* of developmental studies which plans, coordinates, and allocates funds for instruction, counseling and other support services. Community colleges = 30%; senior colleges = 24%.

4. Others. Community colleges = 18%; senior colleges = 32%.

Those organizational structures listed under the category of "other" included: (1) a combination of the three types, (2) development of core disciplinary courses in the occupational and continuing education framework, (3) decentralization of the developmental/remedial courses to fit into sequential design of the departmental offerings, and (4) the offer of tutoring and individual help to all students through a learning assistance center (Rouche and Snow, 1977).

Senior colleges' responses differed somewhat from those of the community colleges in the "other" category. A large proportion of them (32 percent) showed differences from the four categories mentioned. Among their responses, senior colleges mentioned: present developments of formal structures for developing programs, voluntary programs established through counseling centers, tutoring services with student personnel, and the assignment of faculty advisors to incoming students.

Various programming design efforts stem directly from the situations in which they exist. Different settings obviously have different resources and different problems. For example, those colleges located in inner-city areas have different needs and problems than those colleges located in suburban or rural areas. But certain factors in the development of a program design should be considered.

In 1971, Davis' study concluded that institutional commitment should provide an established power base for an individual directing special programs or developmental studies; this commitment appears to be a crucial factor to the successful incorporation of both the program and the low-achieving student into the mainstream of the academic institution. In 1976, Cross discovered that the establishment of a division or department of developmental studies in community colleges had increased from 20 percent in 1970 to 36 percent in 1974. Roueche and Snow's survey indicates even greater growth. In effect, it found that nearly 50 percent of the community and senior colleges had established a total program of recruitment, counseling, instruction, evaluation; and the program included a director. Results of the Roueche-Snow study suggest that many of the efforts being made presently to integrate the developmental or the high-risk student into the mainstream of learning are successful. In effect, the success of these efforts is making institutional renewal and survival a possibility at a time when both that renewal and that survival are important issues.

The issue of "tracking" students in and out of developmental programs is as controversial an issue today as it has been historically. The question continues whether or not we should be in the business of developing total

programs or merely providing individual courses. A most recent study observes that developmental programs which are characterized by individual — often isolated — courses and departments were found in 33 percent of the senior colleges and 40 percent of the community colleges reporting low success with students. These individual or isolated courses were spread across the campuses on which they were offered. By contrast, programs organized by departments or by divisions accounted for the organizational patterns found in 67 percent of both senior and community colleges located in the high success group. In other words, the totally-integrated program appears to yield better results than does the isolated group of courses (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Those colleges having a separate department or division have provided an administrative leader or director who plans and makes fund coordination and allocation decisions. Those colleges with programs comprised of faculty members working within their individual academic departments, but working with counselors, reported but moderate success. These colleges obviously felt better about this design than they did about isolated courses. The data on student completion rates definitely supported the perception that this design had more potential for effectiveness than did the design of isolated courses located at various points about the campus.

The establishment of a division or department of developmental studies can be considered a very dramatic move toward effecting positive student change. As a separate division or department, it is a highly visible area in which innovation can occur. These innovations along instructional and counseling lines can be designed and implemented to work specifically with the low-achiever. Indeed, the incorporation of disadvantaged students into educational institutions has created some very obvious organizational changes; in fact, the system must be as flexible as possible in order to respond to the diversity of its students.

The recommendation of the recent Roueche and Snow survey reflects an earlier recommendation made by Roueche and Kirk in 1973 — that is, that a department or a division of developmental studies is still necessary. A department in effect, makes a concerted frontal attack upon the challenge of providing programs for the nontraditional student. The department must not be designed or positioned in such a way that it excludes itself from college involvement. Moreover, it must avoid being merely a so-called "bonehead" division. It aims to meet, head-on, those critics who proclaim that providing remedial education means merely watering down existing content and giving away grades and credits for less than credit work. It must make a concerted effort to offer both academic and human development skill courses which serve all students, both traditional and nontraditional.

Choices: Organizational Patterns

There are optional patterns of organization for developmental studies programs. As has been indicated earlier, the one organizational pattern considered most successful has been the separate division of developmental studies. The pattern of organization characterized by isolated courses has as its greatest drawback the inability of instructors to work together consistently in both the design and evaluation of their efforts; thus, in turn, the students most likely will not perceive a "wholeness" in their instructional efforts. As cited earlier, these programs report slight, if any, success.

Another pattern of organization — that of courses remaining attached to individual curriculum areas but yet clearly marked and designed on a developmental basis — are the programs demonstrating relative success; at least the success with this design is greater than the success with isolated courses. In this design instructors assume all responsibility for coordinating their efforts; however, the total picture to the student is still a foggy one. Presidents and administrators who prefer a separate division, or who had operated a separate division and abolished it, had used budgetary and enrollment difficulties as explanation for their action. Their decision to realign or redesign a separate division was not made as a result of its ineffectiveness.

Those programs following the program design relying upon tutoring (whether by a well-defined tutoring assistance program or by faculty advisors for students) omit one basic agreed-upon need of the low-achiever or disadvantaged student. This need is one for direction, for continued support in terms of structure, and for incentive to continue. Indeed, it has been well-documented that disadvantaged students more often than not see themselves in a failure pattern; and unless they are placed in an environment that promotes immediate forms of success and provides continuous direction, these students very likely will behave in ways that will promote their own failure. Therefore, this program — providing neither a positive ongoing environment nor constant reinforcement to set tight schedules and consistent work patterns — lacks two of the success factors characterizing strong developmental studies efforts.

It might be obvious that the rationale for any one of the heretofore-mentioned programs would be based upon the need to consider already tight budgets that affect both program design and instructional personnel. They, too, might be working upon the assumption that "each of us should take care of his own." It also works upon the suspicion that the only necessary ingredient to college success is improved academic skills.

Perhaps it would be helpful to mention, at this point, several institutions whose successful developmental studies programs have been recognized in recent developmental studies literature. The description of these programs here is only an acknowledgment of the diverse ways in which

developmental studies programs might be configured; it is not to suggest that these are the only successful programs in existence. Too, the descriptions do not necessarily suggest that these program configurations are the most successful arrangements. It goes without saying that every institution — depending upon its size, its budget, its needs — must align its developmental studies' efforts in accordance with its mission and its financial ability. But overall, and most importantly, these successful programs have one common characteristic; each of them has made efforts to be compatible with the total college mission. Each recognizes the need for becoming a strong program within itself as well as a support service for the rest of the institution. As one will recognize, the following program designs exemplify varying attempts that a developmental effort might effectively make to become a distinctly significant *part* of the institution. This factor alone makes a tremendous contribution to program success.

On the *South Campus of Tarrant County Junior College* in Texas, students are enrolled in developmental studies on a block-schedule basis; in other words, course selections and course times are pre-determined for large groups of developmental students. There are five sections of approximately 20 students per section assigned to a group of six staff members, each of whom teaches a different subject. The students in the same section attend classes as a unit. The instructional group of five instructors and one counselor is called a *vertical team;* this team is responsible for the educational experiences of approximately 100 students during their initial year in college. At this time three such vertical teams exist.

The basic studies program is one of seven departments in the division of General Studies at South Campus. The Applied Studies department includes several special programs in pre-technical, pre-business, and a veterans' up-bound program, as well as remedial courses and developmental English. The Reading department offers laboratory courses in reading and study skills. The Mathematics department, in another division, offers a remedial course in Introductory Mathematics. The Human Development and Special Services department offers courses in Human Relations and Human Development; these courses are directed at low-income, educationally-disadvantaged students.

Ohio University in Athens has designed a developmental program with major foci — remedial studies and academic tutoring. The remedial courses are open on a voluntary basis to those students who did poorly on their diagnostic tests. The tutoring program is open to any student doing below average work in a lower division course; this tutoring is offered at no charge to the student. Courses in study skills as well as courses in writing skills appear under the auspices of the student developmental program. Participation in the program is voluntary.

El Paso Community College in Colorado Springs, Colorado, has a developmental studies division with students entering as a result of

placement test scores or their own perceptions of skill deficiency. The program focuses upon three areas: reading skills, English, and mathematics (with four levels of remedial courses offered in each of these areas). Organizationally, the developmental studies program is a division within the General Studies area. The program is administered by a director; faculty have chosen to work in this area of developmental studies.

At *El Centro College*, in Dallas, Texas, the Developmental Studies program is a separate division including courses in reading, writing, math, and human development. A team of instructors and counselors work specifically within this division, serving approximately 400 full-time students per semester. The single division was created with the belief that it would be educationally sound for instructors to cooperatively plan learning experiences for these students, and that team teaching and interdisciplinary approaches would enable students to view all their classroom experiences as having a common purpose, a wholeness. The inclusion of counselors and instructors within this one division was an attempt to minimize the misunderstanding which typically exists between counselors and instructors in many educational institutions.

There is a new program at *Kent State University* in Ohio. The program of Developmental Services stresses the construction of individualized programs for each student based upon his or her needs. Four components comprise the learning development program. (1) A study skills component makes a survey of the student study habits and his attitudes towards university course work. (2) A non-credit reading course is offered each quarter. (3) Students receive academic and/or personal counseling in either individual or group sessions. (4) Volunteers from the university are available for individual and for small group tutoring in specific courses. Staff members for the developmental program were selected on the basis of interest and of specific qualifications.

Eastern Kentucky University in Richmond established a counseling and learning laboratory in 1969, supported the program with institutional funds, and appointed a program supervisor. The program is designed to provide assistance to students having academic difficulty. This assistance includes laboratory work for: (1) the improvement of basic learning skills; (2) interpretation of aptitude, interest and achievement test skills and the resultant development of a program of evaluation; (3) assistance in specific subject matters through the use of program instruction and tutors; and (4) efforts at creating opportunities for personal development. It is interesting to note that in this laboratory there is an effort to guard against possible academic "labeling" as the names of the program participants are confidential (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, North Carolina, has a developmental studies program that is designated Advancement Studies. There are twelve different courses representing four major disciplines within Advancement Study. The courses are within the areas of

mathematics, communications skills, reading, and science. Students are placed in Advancement Studies courses primarily through placement testing or through staff referral. Advancement Studies is a component of the General Studies Division at Central Piedmont, and the department head of Advanced Studies reports directly to the vice-president of General Studies. There are lead instructors in each course area, reporting to the department head.

At *San Antonio College* in Texas, there are from nine to eleven departments involved in teaching the high-risk students each semester. A representative or a coordinator for the developmental courses is designated in each department. This representative or coordinator is the individual responsible for coordinating remedial course efforts within the department, and he acts as a liaison with the overall coordinator of developmental studies. A committee for developmental studies is active, and each of these coordinators serves as a member of that committee. Assignments for teaching developmental courses are as often done on a volunteer basis as they are on a general rotation basis. Each instructor is asked to teach at least one developmental studies course per semester. No counselors are specifically assigned to the developmental program or to high-risk students.

Bronx Community College of the City University of New York provides a remedial program into which students are placed as results of placement tests which demonstrate a need of remedial help. Students demonstrating this need are placed in one or more of several pre-college courses. There are one-semester preparatory courses ranging from three to six hours of class time per week; they are designed to help the student to master the basic skills and content that will enable him to cope with college-level work. Each of the remedial courses is managed by the appropriate academic department within the college. There is a committee on remediation that manages the special projects and tutorial programs.

The *University of Texas in Austin* has two developmentally-oriented programs. The first of these is the Provisional Admissions Program (PAP). The university does not have an open-door admissions policy; however, PAP is designed to allow students who, upon interview with a counselor, can demonstrate that their SAT scores and their high school grades do not adequately represent their true academic potential, to enroll in the special program. Successful summer course work — successful being interpreted as 2.0 GPA and 12 semester hours — is seen as the eventual goal of this program. The students, thus, will hopefully move into the mainstream of the university's academic curricula. The other developmentally-oriented program is the Reading and Study Skills Laboratory (RASSL). This laboratory is university-sponsored and is designed to promote individual academic growth. It provides a number of relatively short, non-credit courses in reading and study skills and a tutorial program which provides subject area supplementation. All of

RASSL's services are open to the general student population. The goal of these courses is, obviously, to reach students with learning deficiencies or poor study habits and provide them with the opportunities for improvement. Both the PAP and the RASSL Programs are coordinated by the Division of General and Comparative Studies.

The developmental program at *Florida Junior College* at Jacksonville, North Campus, receives students on a voluntary basis; however, incoming freshmen who score below the tenth grade level on the Nelson Denny Reading Test are strongly encouraged to enroll in the program. Courses within the program receive college credit; however, rather than the traditional three hours, they meet five hours per week to allow for additional instruction. The courses deal with communication and reading skills, math skills, and a self-exploration course.

Examples of programs meeting the description of learning assistance centers are located at Monterey Peninsula College, University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Wisconsin. These programs, also, are selected for description here as they responded to a recent survey with specific information that allowed the researchers to place the responses in a consistent reporting format.

Monterey Peninsula College in California has a Learning Center. It has as its goal the development of basic skills needed by students who are either enrolled or preparing to enroll in content courses at MPC or at another institution of higher learning. These skills are described as the reading, writing, speaking, and studying techniques that the student must have to succeed in college-level courses. Learning, in the majority of these courses, is self-paced; too, students are allowed to take more than one semester to complete a course. There are additional courses offered dealing with psychology, ecnomics, sociology, history, political science, and business. Tutors are available to any student who feels the need for personal assistance.

The *University of California at Berkeley* has designed its developmental program as remedial courses that emanate from three different sources within the University — the Mathematics Department, Subject A Department, and the Student Learning Center. Its Learning Center is staffed by individuals who have diagnosed students' learning difficulties, determined the appropriate remediation, and worked to support efforts to develop effective academic skills. The Center offers tutoring and skills help in reading, writing, study skills, basic mathematics, social sciences, and science courses. In addition to these courses, the Center's student services include non-credit mini-courses designed to improve reading, writing, test-taking skills, and mathematics. Tutors are available for helping students in their areas of subject deficiencies. Self-help materials — focusing on improvement of the learning skills — are maintained in the Center's library-laboratory. Most importantly, there is, presently, a director of the Student Learning Center. She works in coordi-

nation with a ten-member faculty advisory board — a board that meets quarterly to provide suggestions for the Center's program. It also coordinates the operation of the Center with the academic departments.

The *University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire* has instituted a "transitional year program." This program is designed to perform a transitional function for certain students between high school and college; specifically, the students are those demonstrating that they do not have adequate preparation for college-level work. The primary design of the program is such to be flexible enough to deal with individual students' specific needs to ready them for college course work. There is little mention made in the program's prospectus of efforts toward self-concept or pscho-social development. Three basic course types are provided within this program: communication skills, reading, and critical study skills. Background courses are also provided in specific content areas. A tutoring service is provided for the student. The tutor has three areas of responsibility: advising the student about his specific educational strengths and weaknesses, working with course instructors in coordination of instruction efforts, and attempting to help the student adjust to the new university environment.

As was mentioned earlier, the advantages and the disadvantages of various program patterns will most likely be more noticeable at the institutional level; and very often the environment, the geographical location, and the financial status of the institution do much to promote specific program designs. As a result, a rather general statement should be made about the variety of program patterns. In effect, each institution must consider its mission and its ability to finance the commitments made in its mission statement. It can receive some solid advice once these decisions have been made, however.

There are authors in the field who have made recommendations as to the design of successful developmental studies programs. An overwhelmingly strong recommendation has been made in favor of a separately organized division of developmental studies, a divison with its own staff, and its own administrative head. A second overwhelming recommendation is that program content should be of real value to the student, that the student should see some relevance between what he is doing at the present time and what he will be doing and that he be given enough time in which to do it (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

Another recommendation that has effect upon program design is that of staffing. The advantages, no matter what the program pattern, of having a willing instructor cannot be over-emphasized. Within any program design — whether isolated courses, single division pattern or learning center — staffing requirements should be stringent ones with top priority being given to potential instructors who express strong desire to work with developmental studies students.

Any program patterns having a high regard for a successful learning

environment will have that regard to its advantage. It cannot be overemphasized that students must have successful experiences, and those successful experiences should be immediate ones. It cannot be overstated that the chances for any program to be successful are increased if it has the advantage of administration and faculty who expect it will succeed. The disadvantage of any program pattern would lie in its inability to help the student take charge of his own development. If indeed the student is left to his own devices, if he must make decisions about his own study habits, if he feels that no one else is responsible for him but himself, the chances of his being successful are greatly diminished. The student would be at a disadvantage if indeed he saw no major purpose in his endeavors; in other words, if he could not envision a meaningful "whole" to these developmental experiences, chances are that they would not be considered of much value to him.

Thus, those who would support a separate division of developmental studies point out the advantages to the student of this design. The student is in a controlled atmosphere, his successes are monitored; in fact, they are planned for. He has instructors who have dedicated themselves to working with his problems and with his skill deficiencies; they are willing to take him where he is and help him get where he is going, including helping him practice some coping skills for making the transition into college-level courses.

Although strong recommendations are made for a separate division of developmental studies, a separate division is not without its disadvantages. There are those who would fear labeling or categorization of certain "types" of students if they were placed into a separate division. However, research is bearing out that these separate division programs are most likely to be successful. Even a cursory look at the history of presently successful separate departments or division programs would indicate that the beginnings of those developmental efforts were not easy ones. It is the success of these programs that now continues to point to the wisdom of this design choice.

In a discussion of successful programmatic designs, the important element of self-concept development must be given consideration. This element is such an important aspect of program design for developmental studies students that any program configuration capable of enhancing this development should receive priority ranking. The separate division approach appears to hold the greatest advantage for a holistic approach to self-concept development. It is in this enterprise that every instructor can be a contributing agent to positive reinforcement and ongoing support.

Community colleges, in the latest national survey, reported that 30 percent had separate divisions, 34 percent had isolated courses, 18 percent had interdisciplinary teams, and another 18 percent had either combir ations of these three or a different program altogether. Senior colleges

reported 24 percent had separate divisions, 32 percent had isolated courses, 11 percent had interdisciplinary teams and 32.4 percent had either combinations of these three or others entirely different (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

The image of a program is important to the recruitment and the retaining of nontraditional students. A good image is defined as how a student feels about his welcome, about how he is treated by faculty, counselors, and clerical personnel, and whether or not he has curriculum choices that are valuable to him. Historically, there were common charges that remedial or developmental programs were racist by intent or by design (Roueche and Kirk, 1973). But a recent study noted that "student success was enhanced and magnified by enrollment and persistence in the special basic, guided, or developmental studies programs (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

It is important that the institution promote ongoing evaluation. If the evaluative results are good, this information should be circulated among high school counselors as well as within those areas frequented by the more nontraditional students. If the results are not good, steps should be taken to improve the learning conditions. Perhaps the most important effort that an institution can make in laying groundwork for a successful developmental studies program, no matter what the design, is to help create this strong image by clarifying program intent, by saying what it is the institution believes it is doing. Designers and administrators of developmental programs should make every effort to face the misconceptions that may have developed historically about developmental education and keep before the public strong results of program efforts. Students talk to students, and if this talk reflects students' beliefs that the program is committed to and geared toward their own success and that the administrators and instructors are following the dictates of this commitment, the program will develop a positive image.

Recruitment, Admission, Diagnosis and Placement

Recruitment

Recruitment of nontraditional student should not take place unless the institution has an effective educational program available. Once the program is a reality, however, the program should look forward to developing sound recruitment procedures. Traditional recruiting strategies — such as traditional teaching and counseling — are most likely to be ineffective in convincing the nontraditional student that the institution is for him. These students will rarely be among those who attend "college days" at the local institution, will not be among those

receiving the college newspaper being mailed to high school seniors, and will not be among those visiting Rotary and Lions Club groups. Approaching students through these traditional methods has not proven to be effective in reaching the low-achiever. Because the average or below-average high school student does not envision himself as either qualified or eligible for typical work or loan opportunities, he would find no particular interest in investigating these avenues for college entrance. Furthermore, when one considers that the average community college student is in his mid-twenties, it is at once apparent how restricted the traditional efforts at recruitment actually are (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

Colleges which are attracting large numbers of new students are doing so through a variety of exciting strategies. The excitement is created by the use of "new" recruitment personnel and "new" recruiting procedures. Recruitment of high-risk students, since 1971, has continued to increase. Davis (1975) reported 66 percent of all colleges were involved in some kind of recruitment effort. Cross (1976) found that 64 percent of the community colleges, in 1970, were recruiting nontraditional students and, in 1974, 82 percent. A recent national survey found that 89 percent of the community colleges were recruiting nontraditional students through local newspapers, and 60 percent of the senior colleges were recruiting through blanket mailouts to high school seniors. Other popular recruitment methods included: (1) radio advertisements, (2) solicitation of local agencies, (3) television advertisements, (4) high school visitations, (5) career days and campus open-house, (6) booths at shopping malls, (7) booths at local fairs, (8) personal telephone calls, (9) college relation committees visiting high schools, military bases, prisons, and homes (10) special projects such as "re-entry," "students older-than-average," and the use of mobil vans (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Cross (1976) found that between 1970 and 1974 visits to high schools and disadvantaged areas were up 8 percent; work with community agencies and leaders was up 15 percent; the use of students to help in recruiting was up 9 percent (Cross, 1976, p. 236).

It is obvious that potential students have developed expectations of colleges based on the public images of those institutions. Obviously, community colleges more easily attract high-risk students inasmuch as the social stereotype of these colleges is that they are smaller, more personal and academically less rigorous, and that they provide more opportunity for a true second chance. The social stereotype of senior colleges, however, is that they are more prestigious and more difficult to enter. A college's image is always susceptible to change, but a strong open-door policy that has been steadfastly enforced, that allows any student to enter and meet with a reasonable degree of success, is a most effective recruiting tool for those institutions wishing to enroll the non-traditional student.

A recent survey reveals that senior and community colleges attracting

large proportions of high-risk students rely heavily on their favorable public images to attract these students. Indeed, they go to extra lengths to improve these images. Illustrative of this finding is that senior colleges which are most successful with new students report using a greater variety of methods than their successful community college counterparts (Roueche and Snow, 1977). The task of overcoming poor public images is a challenging task for senior institutions trying to attract new students. Recent publicity aimed at poor management, irrelevancy of programs, and lack of public accountability have created a particularly difficult job for many colleges.

A workable recruitment technique can be implemented when colleges recognize the power of students talking to students. Students are particularly interested in their chances of success, and while many colleges utilize staff professionals to convey their messages, peers may be more convincing. Many colleges are reporting that they use recruitment teams — teams made up of professionals and students. The institutions feel that the team more accurately reflects the college's personality than would a strictly professional group. It has been discovered that as these students ask tough questions, they are looking for very honest answers; and those students who know the ropes are closer to the issues and can speak more honestly from their own personal experiences.

Recruitment can be a viable institutional change agent as prospective student concerns are conveyed to the recruiters. The recruiters can either give some superficial responses to these questions, they can effect some honest inquiry, or they can come up with some facts. It is indeed obvious that recruiters need open lines of communication with their colleagues and with their administrators who can supply the answers to these questions. It is such dialogue between college constituents, recruiters, instructors, and administrators that can help clarify some institutional goals. Recruitment, as seen from this perspective, would serve both a public relations and a needs assessment effort. It is through the recruitment process that public and institutional needs could be identified.

A word at this point about the general nature of recruiters is appropriate. There is a need to employ minority recruiters to recruit minority students. Yet, the use of student recruiters, no matter what their ethnic background, is very effective. These recruiters could visit public places and meet prospective nontraditional students. For example, El Centro College in Dallas uses a mobil van; the van goes to all parts of the city, and the recruiters employ the van as a counseling, interviewing, question-asking, recruiting location. The van is parked in neighborhood or school areas, and potential students are interviewed (Rouech and Kirk, 973). In fact, similar recruiting techniques are in force with other community colleges as their student recruiters make door-to-door visits (Spencer, 1972).

There have been other less generally applicable experiments in the recruiting area; for example, starter classes in disadvantaged areas have

been instituted. These classes are efforts to get individuals accustomed to going to school, setting up means of transportation, helping make some solid vocational decisions and aligning these decisions with appropriate college courses.

Thus, recruitment is not a passive activity. It needs serious planning and strong support. The types of student recruitment and the financial support given it are on the increase. The numbers of institutions reporting varied recruitment activities emphasize that no one, two, or three recruitment techniques are most popular. In fact, the techniques need to be as diverse as is the student population.

There is at least one common factor important to all recruitment processes, however. The dissemination of recruitment materials is a common recruitment activity; the content of those materials is of particular importance. On the one hand, the recruitment materials must be readable, the readability level for nontraditional students is somewhere around the seventh grade. Therefore, in order for the written materials to be of any use, the student must be able to read them. The development of these materials must be done with particular ideas in mind: (1) that the information available in these materials should have some relevance to the student (i.e., she/he should envision some immediate payoff from enrollment in college courses); (2) the materials should attack honestly many of the conceptions these nontraditional students might hold about entering college (i.e., difficulty of the registration process, fear of being turned away, problems with transportation, concerns with financial support, and opportunities for job placement upon completion).

The work of the recruiter can be most quickly and effectively destroyed if the nontraditional student undertakes to apply for admission to the institution and finds that the good news he heard on the outside is not so good once he enters the institution. If he finds personnel generally unaccepting and requirements for registration complicated and time-consuming, he most likely will place less value on the words of the recruiter or the advice of his own personal contact and choose not to continue the admissions process at all.

Admission

Obviously, responding to the beginning student is a complex task on the part of the college. Applications for admission are processed in various ways in different colleges and universities. Registration methods vary from a first-come, first-serve basis to very intricate reservation systems. Generally, registration at any college is likely characterized by change; at some institutions, every semester or every year brings an addition to or deletion from the registration process. To this organizational complexity the ingredient of the ill-prepared student is added.

The college should place as few barriers in the path of the nontradi-

tional student as possible. In other words, the college should require only that information that meets the requirements of its bookkeeping system; that is, it should require only names, social security numbers, and whatever demographic data might be necessary. Whatever test information, whether a one-test analysis or multi-battery of tests, should be strictly the decision of the particular receiving institution. The nontraditional student views, with a considerable amount of suspicion and concern, any attempts to retrieve vast amounts of information. Often, he suspects that the information itself is merely a way of gaining evidence that he should not attend the institution at all. Therefore, the more efforts the institution might make to allay these fears and suspicions, the better. Thus, it is a recommendation that only the barest bookkeeping information ought to be required of the student. Every institution must consider the possibility that the nontraditional student will place not nearly the value upon the information the institution is attempting to retrieve as the institution might place upon it. In effect, the admissions process should be kept to a bare-bones procedure.

Diagnosis

"The heart of developmental education is accurate diagnosis of the student's learning problem in order to ameliorate the disparity between his current level of knowledge and performance and the desired level of achievement" (Moore, *New Directions*, 1976, p. 60). Diagnosis is at the heart of eventual success of the nontraditional student. It has been discovered that the high-risk student is most often identified as such by community colleges, and senior colleges rarely label their students; we might expect this finding, as more high-risk students attend community colleges because of the open-door admissions policy than attend senior colleges. It has been the role of the community college to identify these students and provide for them meaningful educational experiences. To do so is to make good on the promise of the open door. Without well-designed programs, colleges are better off not to recruit and admit such students. Four-year colleges now attempting to serve high-risk students should find these comments equally appropriate and useful.

Successful developmental studies programs are identifying their students in a variety of ways. Sacramento City College in California uses admissions counselors as their recognition agents. Often these successful colleges rely heavily on self-concept and personality tests, in addition to the various achievement tests. Other institutions, such as Salt Lake City College, put much emphasis on self-concept and personality assessment but cite testing and consideration of the student's previous education record as their primary means of identification.

There appear to be no consistent identification patterns, however, between successful and unsuccessful two- and four-year colleges (Roueche

and Snow, 1977). There are trends, however, which are indicating some differences in practice. For instance, most often successful programs are found combining testing with counseling to identify their students. Many colleges were indicating that a multitude of factors, with achievement and aptitude tests, are used in considering both placement and diagnosis. It was, however, programs with high student retention and completion that less often utilized students' previous educational records, teacher referral, and self-referrals than did their less successful counterparts. This might indicate that students in these colleges are not judged solely on past performance, but rather they are assessed on their current skill profiles. Apparently, testing is being used more for diagnostic than for placement purposes as there are reports of frequent use of battery testing as opposed to single testing.

El Centro College in Dallas is using a self-assessment method that has worked particularly well. The self-assessment instrument is, very simply, a compilation of points assigned to the student's entry test scores and high school grades, as well as to responses to questions of individual reading and study habits. The student makes his own assessment of his potential chances for collegiate success as he totals his score and consults statistics reflecting past student performance. On the basis of his score and its position within these statistics, the student assesses his chances for success in his chosen classes. El Centro has found that more often than not the student makes, on his own, as solid and honest a response and, therefore, selection of courses as he would had he dealt strictly with a counselor. The real benefit to this method is the student's making his own decision, thus assigning ownership to the choice.

What tests are the best programs using? Both two- and four-year colleges are found often to use the Stanford Achievement Test, some form of a self-concept instrument, and a locally-designed test. In fact, it is important to note that a recent study found not one unsuccessful community college program using any self-concept scale (Roueche and Snow, 1977). It is obvious, therefore, that there is a recognized, inextricable relationship between self-concept development and academic achievement.

For self-concept assessment, the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale, the Tennessee Self-Concept Test and the Spielberger Anxiety Scale have been used extensively in pre-post evaluation of the impact of staff, program, and college upon the student. Pre-test scores on these scales can be used to indicate some counseling and instructional intervention that might be needed; the post-test can be used to measure changes for the evaluation of program components or the overall program impact on students. It should be noted that self-concept and personality scales should not be used as "achievement" tests. Self-concept, moreover, should be viewed in the context of such factors as value orientation, age, expressed objectives, and sub-culture. An important observation is that

of the unique way in which personality factors and academic ability seem to interact to produce student success.

Virginia State College is a senior college which has a successful program that emphasizes academic skill assessment. The college reports good results with diagnostic assessment based on the student's previous educational records. Thus, it appears that there are no ironclad rules for colleges to follow in diagnostic procedures; however, there do appear to be some statistical and commonsense trends.

A recent study discovered that community colleges primarily use testing and counseling to place or to advise students about developmental courses or programs; they use the students' previous records least. Senior colleges use testing as their primary tool, and counseling is one of their least-used methods. To contrast community colleges and senior colleges at this point would be to admit that perhaps community colleges are becoming wary of the validity of records in the type-casting of a student, and perhaps the senior colleges are relying more upon objective criteria in their advisement process. Interestingly enough, however, as enrollment increases occur on both senior and community college campuses, we might expect that colleges will go more and more to the use of indirect mechanical processes and place less importance or particular time priority upon person-to-person processes (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Diagnostic testing assessment services are on the increase as community colleges offer these services in 83 percent of the colleges, and senior colleges provide diagnostic assessment in 68 percent of their institutions. In Davis' 1971 study of all colleges, approximately 50 percent of the colleges provided some assessment of student learning difficulty; today there are more than 75 percent providing this service (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

It has been discovered that community colleges design more of their own tests and use a far greater proportion of these locally-designed tests and diagnosis than do senior colleges. Indeed, in many community colleges this is the primary testing instrument. Senior colleges assess the SAT as their favorite diagnostic/placement instrument. The most commonly used test with all community and senior colleges is, apparently, the Nelson Denny Reading Test (Roueche and Snow, 1977). A list of diagnostic/placement tests most commonly used in two-year colleges would include (by order of institutionally-designated importance) these tests: locally designed tests, other, Nelson Denny Reading, ACT, SAT, a self-concept test, a personality test, Nelson Reading, Stanford Achievement. The most frequently used diagnostic/placement tests in four-year colleges (by order of importance) are: SAT, ACT, locally-designed tests, Nelson Denny Reading, other, a personality test, a self-concept test, the Stanford Achievement, Nelson Reading. There are other tests commonly used by colleges. That list would include such tests as McGraw-Hill Series, Comparative Guidance and Placement Test, Cali-

fornia Achievement Test, and Iowa Test of Basic Skills. There are a variety of English, reading and writing tests as well as interest tests included in this group. Again, it is important to note the battery testing as opposed to unitary testing is apparently in vogue and that self-concept tests are most often used where successful programs are in existence (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Placement

Placement of students in developmental studies programs, thus, comes from a variety of diagnostic processes and techniques. Some placement activities are heavily grounded in self-assessment packages in combination with locally-designed or widely-used tests. It is interesting to note that in 1976, Cross discovered from her survey of two-year colleges that between 1970 and 1974, 20 percent less colleges were requiring their students to enter their remedial courses. In effect, the student is allowed some responsibility for making his decision about potential college success. It is important here, however, that we consider the amount of assistance and direction the student receives at the time the placement decisions are being made. If the students who are typically non-traditional students are allowed to make decisions out of some unrealistic or failure-bound attitudes, then we could expect little of their performance if they continue along traditional college-level avenues. Obviously, the more information given a student about his abilities, solidly-placed in a backdrop of recorded information of patterns characterizing the student's choices in previous years, the more chances that he will make a wise decision for himself. It is, then, that the controversy over the advantages and disadvantages of requiring remedial courses to be taken by the student actually hinges — upon one prime consideration — that the student truly places some value upon his choice.

Criteria: Determination of Program and Course Content

Perhaps the most important criteria to consider in planning program and course content for developmental studies programs is the criteria of relevancy. Unfortunately, the term *relevance* has become almost a meaningless term when it is used in higher education. However, it is most important that the curriculum be designed around the interest of the students if indeed those students are to overcome the negative feelings and the attitudes that most of them bring to a community college. Unfortunately, college curricula most often is determined more by tradition than by the current student or societal needs (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

Those students who would normally attend college consider the traditional curriculum offerings simply part of their expectations about the college environment. However, as new developmental studies students are coming into community colleges, they must see some real relationship between what they are asked to do and what they consider the end result of that request to be. In other words, they need to see some payoff for the efforts that they are making. It is, therefore, that the curriculum of any course that has been dictated strictly by tradition will make little sense to the low-achieving student. Their higher education needs are very practical ones — they need to look for a job, they need to produce some income, and they need to see some of the benefits that college is said to bring in the form of the better life. Their personal goals must somehow be reflected in the program offering. It is, therefore, most important that with each learning experience the student must ascertain that indeed he is getting closer to reaching his goal (Spencer, 1972).

In effect, criteria determining program and course content should be related directly to that which the institution expects of the student upon his completion of the program. Generally, students will be expected to enter their course choices upon completion of the program and to complete those subsequent courses successfully. It is, then, that instructors and administrators of developmental studies programs should interact with those whose job it will be to serve the nontraditional student once he has completed his developmental education. The criteria will be the result of information gained from this interaction.

Programs designed along the guidelines of such criteria will undoubtedly have a positive effect upon the students' efforts in that course. The major concomitant of the criteria is that the student must see relevancy and payoff. The payoff, as he envisions it, should be both immediate and long-term. And one major consideration is that of giving credit for developmental studies programs. Obviously, the developmental student's interests in a developmental program and his commitment to doing well in that program is greatly enhanced when he is earning credit for his efforts. Credit is not a difficult reward to give to allow a student to feel some achievement in a given task. Research provides evidence that the practice of giving credit has shown to provide improvement in student motivation and attitude (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

Awarding students credit is a way that a college has of legitimizing its redemptive action. Funding patterns do vary from state to state, but a recent study found no states failing to legitimize developmental courses, such as remedial English or math (Roueche and Snow, 1977). The same study discovered that over half of the community colleges and nearly 40 percent of the senior colleges were granting degree credit for developmental courses, with almost all granting some form of institutional credit (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

As indicated earlier, the trend appears to be a progressive one toward credit in both community and senior colleges. In fact, those colleges, both senior and community, reporting success with the high-risk or nontraditional student more often offer both institutional credit and credit towards the transfer of their developmental courses than do their less successful counterparts. For the most part, they offer full-term, credit courses which are transferable to the regular curriculum. In this manner the developmental courses are merely one facet of a well-conceptualized curriculum.

Nontraditional students who are dealing with personal and predominant failure identities should be given the incentive for academic work through the provision of credit, no less than should the academically successful students. The argument too often is the criticism that providing credit for below-college-level work would cheapen the eventual degree or would lower standards. Indeed, if all students graduated from secondary school with a strong degree of academic proficiency, then perhaps the controversy about "standards" would be a solid one. However, the "standards" issue should be reassessed, and the real issue should be "where we would like to find ourselves at the end of the educational process." Indeed, the end result should be an individual who can make it in the job market as well as in his personal life. It is *these standards* that we should most strongly develop and uphold.

Developmental studies programs are characterized primarily as full-term endeavors. In fact, more successful programs are characterized as those lasting a full year or more. For example, Tarrant County Community College (Texas), South Campus, is an example of the kind of programming design to provide a full year's work. This program is designed as an interdisciplinary curriculum; it is aimed at creating a workable learning environment. Those students completing basic studies at Tarrant County and going on to earn the A. A. degree are taking advantage of articulation agreements between Tarrant County and major universities to transfer full credit for the developmental courses taken at Tarrant County.

As was mentioned previously, developmental studies programs are found to be of several different program designs. Most are interdisciplinary with instructors remaining in their own divisions and teaching developmental courses within those divisions. Others are non-interdisciplinary in that they are complete within themselves; they are, in effect, separate divisions. As stated earlier, it is the separate division concept that is most often cited as the most valuable tool for dealing with the nontraditional student.

Instruction

As program designs are varied, so are instructional activities within these designs. Researchers are observing that course structure can be placed anywhere on a broad continuum from a very traditional class effort to a self-paced mode of instruction. Although the instructional patterns of the developmental program are varied, there are several overriding factors which should be included in every decision as to the instructional patterning. Roueche calls the outstanding factor to be considered one of "creating an environment for learning." (Roueche, 1976). In other words, the student should feel that the environment in which he is to work is one that is responsive to him and designed for his success. He must expect several things to occur and find them to be so.

(1) He must feel that his instructor is in his corner.

(2) He must feel that the person in charge of the classroom activity and the dispensing of skill information is one whose primary job is to take whatever steps necessary to meet his present capabilities.

Because students come to community colleges with a variety of abilities knowledge levels, and perceptions, they may expect to fail. They have failed in the past and this experience will create an expectancy to do so again. Therefore, part of the instructor's efforts should be to create an environment in which the student can experience success. Another factor to be considered, one that is inclusive in this environment for learning, is that of allowing the student to know what is expected of him in very realistic terms.

(3) He should have as clear a picture of his task on a day-by-day, month-by-month basis as is possible.

(4) He should be told and explained the relevancy of what he is doing.

(5) He should be informed as to how he will be evaluated for his efforts.

(6) Most importantly, he should be carefully guided in his day-by-day activities.

Successful developmental programs are those which help create a good learning environment by outlining for the student what the expectations of his achievements are. These programs have well-defined, written goals and objectives for the course work. The criteria used to decide what these measurable goals and objectives are have been the results of consultation with others who have articulated those skills the student must master before he can successfully complete any subsequent work. Another factor in the environment they have created is that the student recognizes that he will be allowed time, an important variable, to reach the stated goals and objectives. In effect, he is not going to be penalized for the level at which he enters the course; rather, there will be instructional strategies

and techniques available that have been designed to address the needs that he brings with him. He, therefore, will envision his chances for success to be real ones.

Moore observes that classroom management skills contribute to an increase in student learning for the nontraditional student. He writes of several of these skills in describing what he considers to be important climates for learning.

One of the skills is creating a *climate for clarity.* This term is used to suggest that as long as the student understands what is being talked about, is able to set some parameters and facilitate communication about the course work, and is able to work from an agreed-upon base, he will be more at ease with course work.

Another skill Moore mentions is that of the teacher establishing a *climate of inquiry.* In effect he is suggesting that the instructor teach the slow achiever to ask good questions, assuring him that good question-asking is as good and as important as good question-answering. With the encouragement to ask questions comes the instructor's responsibility to be a willing respondent and a patient answerer.

Another skill on the part of the instructor is one of developing a *climate of competence.* This skill Moore defines as the instructor's being able to teach his student the skills necessary to be successful in his particular course and in subsequent courses, and that through the acquisition of these skills, the student will become more confident about his ability to do academic work.

Another skill Moore mentions is that of the instructor's providing a *climate of instructional alternatives.* He is expected to provide various formats for individual students, thereby offering them numerous instructional frameworks for the teaching-learning process.

Moore goes on to discuss a *climate of continuity* and a *climate of balance.* On the one hand, he sees a systematic group of educational experiences which have been organized in a sequential order that would enhance the student's understanding of the skills that he is attempting to learn. On the other, he mentions that how fast the student makes progress is not the important issue, but rather that he is able to make significant, meaningful progress, that he clearly understands one concept before he moves on to the next (Moore, *New Directions,* 1976, pp. 65-68).

Roueche notes that teaching of effectiveness is probably the single most important factor in the entire developmental program. For example, traditional approaches to teaching nontraditional students have been dramatically unsuccessful; therefore, teaching techniques based upon mere listening and reading efforts will not work, and instructional design must start with this recognition (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

It is then, that individualized instruction offers major benefits to nontraditional students. It outlines objectives and the reasons why

students should be learning the content involved in these objectives; the student is informed as to where the program in which he is involved will lead him. In effect, individualized instruction is not a particular methodological technique; rather, it is an attempt to incorporate a variety of teaching approaches that will permit students variable time patterns and allow them to proceed at their own rates. In essence, individualized instruction deals with where the student is and what the individual learning needs of each student are. If the individualized instruction comes in the form of individual packages, then students can proceed at their own speed in sequential fashion to individual assignments with specific directions and with coordinated presentations using various forms of teaching-learning methods.

Basically, the learning packages and individualized instruction methods are based upon the theory that different teaching-learning strategies should be available for students' selection. Cross mentions and describes in detail several of the efforts to individualize instruction. She outlines the basic essentials of programmed instruction — a procedure losing some credibility in recent years as an effective tool because it requires a good deal of self-starting and ability to persevere with a learning task. She also looks at computer-assisted instruction, modules, audio-tutorial processes, and personalized system of instruction. She underscores the belief in the concepts of mastery learning. She, along with other specialists in developmental education, regards Bloom's *Learning for Mastery* to be the basis for all efforts at the individualization of instruction. Cross admits that "diversity is a to-be-prized value in education, especially with our inadequate knowledge about the learning process" (Cross, 1976, p. 110).

Bloom states that it is possible for 95 percent of the students, given sufficient time and appropriate types of help, to master any content area. Mastery learning holds achievement levels constant but varies the time frame. Critics of the flexible time frame concept base their concerns upon fear that "standards" are lowered when this concept is implemented (Bloom, 1971). Yet mastery learning is the effort to cause student learning; and if indeed student learning is to be the major outcome of the educational process, then educators would be hard put to attack the process on the grounds that "standards" would suffer.

The hypothesis of mastery learning is linked very closely to the systematic design of instruction. Moore, Cross, and Roueche have touched upon systematic instruction as being very closely identified with the term, *individualized instruction.* Cross points out that "all methods of individualized education begin with five basic principles that are widely accepted today as essential ingredients for effective learning" (Cross, 1976, p. 52). These five basic principles are:

(1) The learner is active rather than passive;

(2) The goals of learning must be clearly stated to the learner;

(3) Small learning units are sequential;
(4) Feedback and evaluation are an essential part of learning and course revision;
(5) Provision for different rates of learning is provided through self-pacing.

These five elements incorporated into instruction do improve students' grades, they do increase a student's sense of personal control over what happens to him, they do affect his motivation to achieve, they do affect his acquisition of academic skills, and they do affect his self-esteem and his persistence in the academic environment (Roueche and Mink, 1974).

If time is the variable, then attaining mastery — re-studying unmastered objectives, and re-taking the evaluative tests — is merely a matter of reasonable length of time. If progress is truly being made, the student is experiencing success; it is then up to the student and to the instructor to determine a reasonable amount of time that ought to be devoted to that mastery effort.

A recent study looks carefully at developmental instructional practices. More than 80 percent of the community colleges involved in the study distributed learning goals and objectives to their students, they provided pre-testing and individualized materials, and they allowed more than one term to attain mastery. More than 75 percent created their tests, or evaluative procedures, from written objectives that had previously been shared with the student. Almost 70 percent used a variety of assessment methods, rather than a uni-assessment procedure. Community colleges, more than did senior colleges, employed the systems approach to a greater extent. Perhaps the trend toward this instructional approach is on the advance in the senior colleges, as they are only presently beginning to change many of their instructional practices (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Student feedback, of a continuous nature, is important in the evaluation of both teaching techniques and strategy. It is obvious that those most affected by classroom efforts should be consulted as to their outcomes. Such evaluation can be undertaken in a variety of ways. A very common approach is to simply ask the questions. Often the question can be phrased in such a way that the student will receive some help in targeting his answers. Thus, the instructor must give some direction to the questions asked in order to obtain the type of information that would be most useful. For example, she might ask the student if there is anything she does that particularly turns him off, or she might ask what classroom activities the student values the most, or she might suggest that the student tell her about a particularly good experience he has had in her course. The ways of getting information are many; however, the question should be asked forthrightly, honestly, and the responses should be anonymous ones. In fact, the instructor should go out of her way to relieve the student of any concern about the quality, the direction, or

the attitudes reflected in his answers. The instructor should obviously place clear importance upon the value she perceives in honest, direct answers to questions. More importantly, the student should realize that his answers have, indeed, made a difference. If no change occurs or if no response is ever made to some attitudes that have been expressed, the word will quickly spread that little or no value is placed upon the evaluation process at all, and that the exercise is one of futility.

Students' evaluation, from the instructor's point of view, should be made on several levels. If objectives are clearly stated and if avenues by which mastery can be accomplished are available, then the instructor's observation of the student and his efforts should be the best indication of the student's success or lack of it. Students should be given every available avenue for meeting the standards of the objectives; he should be apprised of the content over which he is being tested, and he should be informed immediately as to the results of the instructor's evaluation of his work. Evaluation of a student's classroom efforts and success with content and concepts for mastery should be made in a variety of ways. Inasmuch as students learn in different ways, no one evaluation effort should be applicable to all students. An instructor should implement a varied array of testing/evaluating procedures by which to determine mastery of course content. It is, however, important to point out to a student that traditional testing methods will very often be a part of his continuing education. It is, thereafter, honest to confront the student with some of the realities for which he must develop skill and provide practice experiences for them.

Finally, the grading practices in any developmental studies program should be such that the student can be rewarded for those efforts he makes, but any failure that he experiences should not be held against him. In other words, grades should be non-punitive. They should reflect a passing level of work only, and if the student is not presenting work that is of a passable nature, according to previously agreed-upon standards and objectives, then the grades he receives should reflect the instructor's (more importantly, the institution's) willingness to allow for more time to achieve a passable level. Examples of such non-punitive grading practices are evident in developmental programs at community colleges and senior colleges. Examples of such grading systems generally include the grades of *A, B, C, I* (Incomplete), or *P* (Progress). The *P* grade is in use at numerous institutions; it reflects student effort: it says that the student progressed at his own speed and is making progress, and it implies that the student should either re-enroll or should continue along in some institutionally-decided manner in the same course. Thus, the *P* is a "holding" process whereby the student is not penalized for his inability to "keep up." He is allowed extra time. It is indeed the institution's commitment to the concept that achievement of content is possible if the time variable is a flexible one.

Therefore, negative reinforcement — in terms of inflexible time frames and punitive grades — has done much to contribute to the nontraditional student's lack of success in a community college. A reduction in standards is not a suggestion here; rather, we are suggesting that students should be given credit for achievement. They should be allowed sufficient time (as much as is necessary) to accomplish whatever learning tasks are set before them and receive credit only after the minimum requirements of these learning tasks have been achieved. If they do not achieve the minimum requirements set forth in the course objectives, they are receiving nothing; therefore, there is no need to further discredit them by awarding them an *F* and reinforcing their failure pattern. In the survey of community colleges, Cross observed that in 1970, 27 percent and in 1974, 39 percent had established non-punitive grading, e.g., Pass-No Pass (Cross, 1976, p. 237). Several ivy-league colleges have done away with failing grades, and it is understandable that community colleges can follow in good stead.

Any discussion of the instructional patterns of a developmental classroom must consider the group receiving that instruction; specifically, considerations as to class size and the resultant teaching techniques that must be employed. There is a definite lack of any conclusive experimental support that student achievement in small classes is superior to that in large classes (McKeachie, 1952). In fact, there are recent investigations reporting that large classes were about equal to smaller ones when the course content was the only variable; however, the larger classes were inferior in achieving other objectives (Roueche and Snow, 1977). There are several experimental studies which have indicated that students have more positive attitudes toward the attainment of the course objectives when the classes were small than when they were large (if these students were developmental students) (Zucker, 1966). Cross suggests that many community colleges have begun to capitalize on this phenomenon, as her survey results showed that between 1970 and 1974 an increase of from 58 percent to 72 percent of community colleges had designed remedial classes that were smaller than regular classes.

Indeed, it makes good sense that a smaller class would benefit from the close supervision provided under those circumstances; however, with effective teaching strategies, a seemingly impossible task of managing a large group of developmental students can be effective. There are several basic premises and certain considerations to be made as to teaching-learning strategies, however, when class size is a factor. One consideration would be the positive effect of classroom discussion when the instructor overcomes the usual tendency to discuss with only a few of the students. Discussion which is characterized by much student participation, an accepting attitude on the part of the instructor, a lack of excessive direction by the instructor, and much discussion of ideas related to personal experiences is a particularly effective teaching strategy (Zucker, 1966).

Another strategy, the use of audio-visual materials, is a significant factor in building positive student attitudes toward learning if it is combined with immediate flashback for those students. It is, then, that a strong consideration of the creation of supportive learning environment is of the foremost importance. It is with an open mind and a flexible imagination that successful programs are born. The creation of this climate for learning should be number one on the priority list for the design of any developmental studies program, and a strong look at the factors mentioned as good building blocks for that climate's foundation are recommended.

Understandably, no matter what provisions are made as to instructional practices and grading procedures, there is a dramatic need for continued revision and evaluation of the processes and procedures used to deal with the nontraditional student. Even in the best of developmental studies programs, instructors are continually finding new and varied ways to attack learning problems. So little is known about the learning process and how students learn at all, that continual reassessment of where the developmental studies program is (in terms of the evaluation criteria) is a given. This revision and evaluation should be broad-based with all those on both the receiving and the decision-making end involved — i.e., students, instructors, and administrators.

Support Services

Counseling

Creating a supportive, positive climate — environment for learning — is an institution's major concern. It cannot be underestimated that teaching effectiveness and a student's association with the support services offered by the institution are related. Counselors, who are often a student's initial contacts with the college, are effective facilitators of a caring communication process between the students and the instructors who will teach them.

Recent indications are that counselors are beginning to perform several new roles in today's colleges. They serve such purposeful funtions as consulting rather than counseling, and teaching or training, rather than merely dispensing data about courses and grading policies. In effect, counselors can be instrumental in faculty and staff development efforts: they can share their knowledge about personal interactions and that interaction's effectiveness with students whose self-concepts are not those of the traditionally more successful students. The surveys found that more than 50 percent of the time, community college counselors are attached to developmental courses, and in senior colleges more than 30 percent are working strictly with developmental courses (Roueche and Snow, 1977). In both the senior and community

colleges, the counselor's role, when it was directly attached to the developmental courses, was significantly associated with a high degree of successful performance by the students in those courses.

It is, then, in institutions with counselors attached directly to the developmental studies program that the high-risk student appears to benefit the most. In fact, the developmental counselors have certain characteristics that are recognizable features of success. These characteristics are in the areas of special training for the development of the potential of these high-risk students, their selection on the basis of competency criteria, and in the effective teaching of human development (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Counselors in community colleges were found to teach and to consult, on the average, more than did their senior college counterparts. Cross observed, in her national survey of community colleges, that 57 percent of the community colleges were employing teacher counselors in 1974 as opposed to 36 percent in 1970 (Cross, 1976, p. 237).

Thus, it is found that the counseling staffs are diverse in organizational structure, with heavy loading toward attachment in a full-time capacity to the developmental division or department. It has also been noted, however, that even the regular institutional counselors, those not assigned to developmental courses, have essentially the same impact profiles as the developmental counselors if they are especially trained and selected and have become involved in their new roles with the high-risk student (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Peer counselors have been a recent development. These counselors are students, many having been developmental or regular institutional counselors. The counseling techniques of the trainees are then carefully observed and evaluated by the counselors as they go into the institution-at-large to deal with developmental studies students in particular and with the general student population. Peer counselors are, obviously, effective promoters of a student's painless entrance into college routine and/or between developmental studies courses and those in the regular college curriculum. Obviously, the impact is more dramatic and thus more successful when those peer counselors are former developmental students.

Roueche observed that "counseling is likely to be most effective and best regarded by students when the perceived purpose of such activity is personhood development" (Roueche and Kirk, 1973, p. 74). Students who who have behind them years of academic failure and frustration are not easily led into believing that they can succeed. Those students who work at replacing a predominant "failure identity" with a predominant "success identity" are making a great commitment to themselves. They need much support in this endeavor, and recent studies are upholding the belief that intervention in the educational process with counseling and teaching strategies which promote an improved self-concept is

dramatically effective. Successful programs generally provide some focus on the personhood of each student. The attempt to develop stronger self-concepts deal with three basic behaviors: the ability to recognize and appreciate their own unique talents and abilities, the ability to establish meaningful and lasting human relationships, and the ability to perceive themselves as worthy and valuable human beings (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

The term used to describe the successful individuals completing self-concept improvement strategies is *self-directed.* These self-directed individuals, as a result of strong self-concept development procedures, appear to gain confidence in their ability to succeed. It is obvious, by observation and by experience, that those individuals who are able to succeed on many levels merely reinforce their belief that they can succeed on many others. The power of experiencing success is great; the efforts to improve self-concept are attempts to provide the heretofore "powerless" student with a sense and an honest awareness that he does indeed have "power" over what happens to him.

The development of a positive self-image — self-concept — is effectively carried out in small group discussions and in individual interactions on a one-to-one basis. The development process allows students some opportunities to recognize that they are not the only students with poor academic or social backgrounds. Human development, or self-concept, course instructors are helping students relate with others in the program as peers, and they help these students take positive steps by allowing them to be involved in some group acceptance experiences. The gatherings provide those instructors and the students with numerous opportunities to reinforce each other, thereby developing some acceptable behaviors and providing some strong bases for encouraging more acceptable behavior.

It is not being suggested here that positive self-concept can be handed to a student and that he will accept a new concept in no time at all. In fact, there are those developmental education specialists who would suggest that too many variables are at work to make a permanent, lasting change in an individual's basic self-concept. However, this view appears to provide a negative stance toward personhood development and does not take into consideration the strong research data which would indicate that such self-concept development efforts have been effective in many institutions. The underlying, indeed the most important, factor in the consideration of self-concept development is that of *success breeding success.*

In effect, the task of the developmental studies programs and instructors is to engineer such successful learning opportunities for all of its high-risk students that they are provided with frequent and honest successful experiences. These experiences, then, are evaluated and straightforwardly assigned some realistic value. These successes and

their evaluation are even more strongly reinforced when the student is provided means by which he can foster other successful experiences in situations over which he presently acknowledges that he has little or no control. In other words, the role of the developmental studies instructor is to provide the student with means for continuing to build toward a positive self-concept inasmuch as he provides him with an awareness of some "coping" skills — skills which allow him to move from his more or less protected environment in the developmental learning situation to the "real world." Early studies indicated that the real difficulty for most developmental studies students was in the transition process from developmental studies programs into the regular college mainstream — and so it remains today! But it is with these coping skills and their practice that some of the transition problems might be alleviated or avoided altogether.

It is in a strengthening of the self-concept that a student can learn to make it on his own. And one of the important factors in "making it on his own" is that of his willingness to look more realistically at goals he has chosen for himself and accept a possible alternative to his original life plan. Once a student feels good about himself, he can accept more easily that there are indeed some limitations upon his future plan, but he can envision some other more successful plan and can make efforts to follow it.

Instructional Assistance

In addition to counseling, the student should have the combined efforts of another group of personnel — learning assistance specialists — to supply instructional assistance outside of the classroom. It is always understood that instructors are available to their students for whatever extra instructional assistance they might need after they have left the classroom; however, this instructional assistance might best be described as that occurring as an adjunct to the classroom experience.

Tutorial assistance in the form of peer tutors — students hired in roles similar to those of peer counselors — is a workable technique. The tutorial assistance should also be available to general college students; however, efforts should be made to pair former developmental students with present ones if that pairing can be arranged. This is not to suggest that peer tutoring is not effective unless the experiences are similar. It is to indicate, however, that the past experiences of a similar nature will greatly enhance whatever interaction might occur. It all depends, of course, upon the perceived attitude of that peer tutor towards any student that would come to him for help. The ascertainment of these attitudes would by necessity be at the discretion of the individual making the hiring decisions. A one-to-one relationship cannot be short-changed. Most of us can remember when such a relationship was a necessity for our success in a particular endeavor and how important an accepting

attitude was on the part of the tutor. These tutors can provide an invaluable support service and simultaneously offer evidence that the institution is pledged to make good on its offer of educational opportunities no matter what the needs.

The open-door admissions policy has been an important factor in the development of learning assistance centers. Generally, these centers act as an extension of the classroom teacher in that they provide alternate ways of presenting the classroom material and provide more time to master the content. The centers often offer short- and long-term courses to students who are in need of remedial work or who merely want to improve upon their present performance (Devirian, *et al,* 1974).

Devirian, *et al*, observed that the primary distinguishing feature of these learning assistance centers was their staffing procedures (Devirian, *et al,* 1974). A general tendency is that the newer assistance centers are generally employing part-time professionals and paraprofessionals on somewhat of a trial basis initially, and that the personnel are increased to full-time if the center appears to be a viable institutional alternative to providing extra assistance to all students. A recent study discovered that senior colleges surpassed community colleges in the employment of paraprofessionals in that many colleges used more transitory or "intern-like" personnel than did the senior colleges. It was found that inner-city colleges in densely-populated areas were providing more staffing personnel within their centers; smaller colleges employed fewer full-time administrators, teaching personnel, and counselors in their centers (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

In summary, the relationships that are developed during the first stages of the developmental studies programs are of paramount importance; these relationships would include student-to-student contacts, student-to-counselor contacts, and student-to-instructor contacts. Roueche and Kirk suggested:

> ...Special tutorial and peer counseling to provide reinforcement and instructional help when the student needs it most . . . open laboratories where any students can go any time for assistance in any subject area. (Roueche and Kirk, 1973, p. 91).

These experiences and the resultant relationships are enhanced if they are carried beyond the program or the semester. It is the incorporation of developmental students as peer tutors or peer counselors or recruiters for the developmental program that, on the one hand, reinforces the positive self-concepts that these contacts have sought to develop and, on the other, often brings life blood into the program.

Financial Aid

Another support service to be offered the nontraditional student is one of financial aid. Cross observed in her national survey results that "need"

was used as a major criterion of eligibility for funds. It is often, however, that need is defined too narrowly. An important consideration in the decision as to "need" is one of the total college experience expense. In effect, the entire cost of attending the college, including transportation, tuition, books, food should be considered in the calculation of need (Spencer, 1972). Cross found that in four years there had been an 11 percent increase in the amount of financial aid available to needy students, regardless of their academic standing. In effect, 74 percent of community colleges responding to her survey had aid available for students even while they were on probation (Cross, 1976, p. 236). The allocation of financial aid incentives is yet another strong indication to the nontraditional student that the institution is serious about its commitment to providing education for him.

A most important aspect, then, of the student's belief in the institution's good intentions is in that institution's willingness to disseminate this financial aid information to all students, with particular attention to those nontraditional students who might normally fail to make inquiries or even imagine that their applications for financial aid would be accepted in light of their past academic standing. The information given to students should include the institution's policy on eligibility for aid and where he might go to make application. A most important consideration in the dissemination of any written materials is that the readability level be determined in order that students who read poorly will not be placed at a disadvantage early on. An institution should, furthermore, provide assistance to that student as he applies for aid — assistance in the form of personally facilitating completion of the application's written requirements. Above all, the student should feel that he is getting honest appraisal of his chances for receiving financial aid and that the institution supported his efforts to make such a request.

A common technique within successful developmental programs is in the recruitment process as it applies to financial aid. Earlier, it was mentioned that the student should receive the information and that this information should be understandable to him. To further enhance the possibility that the student will take advantage of financial aid possibilities is the institution's decision to include this information on whatever recruiting processes it carries out. Moreover, students who have successfully completed the program and have done so with the help of financial aid make for good representatives of the process and its results. The potential developmental student will be assured through such a recruiting approach that this situation is not a unique one and that the chances for him to receive financial support while undertaking college work are good. All too often, particularly among nontraditional students, thoughts about financial aid are limited to scholarships for outstanding achievement in previous academic work or to strong "need" support as a result of a family's failure to make money above the poverty

line. Because there are other categories and other means by which criteria for aid can be formulated, the institution has a responsibility to this student to make these criteria known.

CHAPTER IV

STAFFING

A strong educational design geared to the developmental student is the responsibility of the entire institution. It is imperative that everyone within the institution, from the trustees to the administrative staff to every instructor, must value the need for developmental programs. Obviously, someone in the institution's organization must design an effective model for successfully overcoming the deficiencies that non-traditional students are bringing with them to college. The efforts of the institution as a whole must be supported with financial foundations that do not rely upon year-to-year subsidies from federal funding agencies or foundations. The educational design requires the institution's support, both philosophically and financially. The administrative leadership must decide what the institution is going to do for these students. Once these decisions are made and the educational process is designed, the key figure in the educational effort must be selected.

Researchers and practitioners in the field of developmental education agree that the instructor is the key to the design and implementation of an effective program (Roueche and Snow, 1977), "... the central figure in the instructional process ..." (Moore, *New Directions,* 1976, p. 59). Historically, instructors of developmental education courses were teachers just out of graduate school or those teachers who ranked the lowest on the seniority scale at their institution. If separate departments served developmental students with a course or two of developmental instruction, then the usual occurrence was that those teachers with lesser amounts of experience would be selected to teach those students, primarily because they ranked lowest in the "pecking order." Thus, the students needing the most innovative and well-thought-out practices were often being instructed by those who had had little or no experience in the classroom. The results of most of the instruction by inexperienced and/or less than enthusiastic instructors were devastating. The instructor who was forced to teach these courses brought with him to the classroom several negative attitudes that would have made the instruction and thus the student's success very slight. He possibly believed that these students would not do well in his class, and understandably these expectations normally were fulfilled. This instructor generally was not prepared to understand their attitudes about his subject matter, and therefore his reaction to their attitudes would most naturally have been a negative one. For those developmental students whose interests would have possibly been above

average in the course content, their inabilities to master the content in the traditional time sequence would not have been, with traditional teaching-learning techniques, a positive reinforcement for the teacher's enthusiasm.

Faculty

However, the trend presently is that administrators are understanding the need to select instructors for developmental courses who best reflect several strong personality characteristics. The literature about these personality variables abounds with descriptive "super" words, but the final analysis of these descriptions is that there are obviously some teachers who do teach and others who do not. As a broad overview, however, several characteristics can be cited as being those found often in studies of successful developmental programs.

A most important factor in the selection of faculty for the developmental program is in the faculty member's willingness and expressed interest in teaching the nontraditional student. Cross' survey indicated that 56 percent of the community colleges restricted the instruction of their remedial courses to teachers expressing an interest in doing so (Cross, 1976, p. 237). A more recent survey found that 84 percent of the community colleges and 60 percent of the senior colleges employed only teachers who had expressed an interest and made decisions to work with high-risk students (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Those instructors expressing an interest in teaching the nontraditional student would obviously take pride in fulfilling such a teaching assignment. They obviously would have high expectations for their students inasmuch as the expectation of a job well done is that there are some success indicators at the end of it. It is about these teacher expectations that much literature has developed. It has been well-documented that student achievement is very closely tied to that teacher's expectation for that achievement (Bloom, 1971; Roesenthal, 1968). Today's developmental teacher not only expects her students to do well, but she communicates those positive expectations to them in the efforts she makes to teach them. Her positive expectations can be accurately described by many of her classroom behaviors.

One of those classroom behaviors most often seen in a successful developmental teacher is that she has determined the content for her course and has thought through the rationale for that content. She has done her "homework", so to speak, in that she has interacted with those who would be receiving that student upon his successful completion of her course and conferred with them about their expectations of the student's achievement in their own classes. In essence, she is building upon other teachers' expectations of her students (as well as their own) and is attempting to design a curriculum that will best serve those students in their future courses.

Instructors also need to think through the serious case for student motivation. They sense a real lack of motivation typically visible in the more traditional student. The developmental teacher realizes that little is known about what actually motivates anyone to do anything; however, she admits the fact that the student's mere presence is good indication that some motivation, whatever it might be, is at work. In order to deal in a straightforward manner with the student's motivation, or lack of it, the instructor sets about to develop some motivation-inducing techniques. For example, she decides to find and share with the students some realistic, down-to-earth reasons that they should spend any time at all learning course content.

There is the story of the community college math instructor who complained about the student's lack of motivation to learn math. When he was questioned about the high attrition and the low achievement recorded in his classroom, he merely mentioned that the students lacked motivation. But in actuality, they were being required to take several hours of math and were not developing any of the math skills required in their other career courses. In other words, the students showed a lack of motivation for the reason that they could not see any practical value to the time that they were spending in learning these particular mathematical processes. A solution to the motivational problem was found when the developmental instructor surveyed other career courses and determined the specific math skills that were needed in those courses. He went back to his classes and documented for them the skills that they would need in their other courses; he then set about to teach them those skills. It is not surprising, of course, that the high attrition and the low achievement in this instructor's classes were greatly affected. The students felt a renewed interest in the math course, assigning value to time spent in this mathematics class. Needless to say, the students in this instructor's classroom had *improved* motivation, thus improved attitudes.

In conjunction with the instructor's efforts to relate his course content to realistic, immediate payoffs is the commitment to select relevant content. For example, a prison program in a Southern community college developmental program was characterized by a 97 percent black population with well over three-fourths of these students described on the prison records as felons. They were not students one would expect to be highly motivated to learn to read. However, the program director was encouraged by her students' willingness to read and their seeming enjoyment of it. Indeed, observation bore out that reading was going on and that the reading was being done in a relaxed, comfortable atmosphere; the men apparently were valuing their experiences. The books that they were reading, however, were not low-level, low-ability books; rather, they were such books as *Soul on Ice*, *The Fire Next Time*, and *Another Country*. The amazing situation was, however, that the average reading level of that group was third grade. The instructor could note with pride that her idea

to present books that would appeal directly to their particular situation would be a successful technique. She was right! They were going about their reading with the use of a dictionary, but they were *reading* those books!

In effect, a good developmental instructor knows "where the students are." This instructor understands that students must place some value upon content before they will do well in mastering it. The students must envision some very practical utility or application of this content and/or it must be of enough interest to the student to value it for reasons of his own.

A successful developmental teacher understands that students who are encouraged to learn, by these positive means, will reap an extra benefit. This benefit is that of learning to appreciate the content; this appreciation will result in their intentions to continue to learn and to enjoy the learning. We can all remember courses in which we did well, academically, but the ultimate feeling about the course was that we never wanted to take another one like it. These "unintended outcomes of learning" can be disastrous. The developmental teacher who understands the anathema that students place upon routine, traditional means of teaching-learning will go far to avoid teaching them to once again dislike the learning process or to injure their feelings of self-worth. In effect, the instructor carefully sorts out the content that he wishes his students to learn. Then he decides to judge his teaching by more than one criterion. In other words, he wants to find, at the end of his course, that students have learned his content as well as have learned to enjoy the learning, that they have learned to strengthen good feelings about themselves, and that they have an ability to cope with problems they confront in other learning situations.

The teacher who teaches the high-risk student must, first of all, be an honest, caring individual. He must not feel that the high-risk student has been irrevocably deformed or damaged as a result of his past poor academic showing or that this showing indicates inability to do well. He admits that the deficiencies the student brings with him are indeed barriers to a successful academic pattern; however, he assumes the responsibility to undertake the processes to overcome these deficiencies. These instructors are ones who are honestly communicating with their students that there are certain skills that must be learned to "make it." They understand that students can more likely deal with the truth when it is framed in a positive setting than they can deal with dishonesty about some unrealistic expectations of their performance. The student is quick to understand a teacher's true perceptions of him and his abilities. If the teacher comes across as skeptical about the student's chances for success, the student finds that these feelings merely reinforce his own negative ones.

Successful developmental teachers understand nontraditional stu-

dents. They understand that most high-risk students find themselves "out of control" and at the mercy of powerful "others." Roueche and Mink note that these individuals — called "externals" — believe that they have little control over what happens to them in their daily lives (Roueche and Mink, 1976). Therefore, they feel that the cues they receive from a powerful person (one in authority) spell out the chances of success or failure. Thus, a strong instructor recognizes that he must, at all times, encourage feelings of chances for success. He needs to maintain positive reinforcement processes and set up a learning environment that encourages students to attend class and to continue to work at mastery and, thus, to have the opportunity to achieve some success. He knows that successful experiences provide strong senses of control and provide impetus toward "internality."

If teachers are so interested in their students that they aim their selections for both content and teaching strategies at promoting students' learning, they are showing yet another important characteristic. This characteristic is one of involvement with students. One classroom behavior which communicates this involvement is learning the names of students and calling them by their names whenever they are called upon in class or seen on the campus. The power of knowing a person's name and using it cannot be understated. It expresses and communicates a real interest in the student as a person, and it shows the learner that his instructor is placing as much interest upon him as he is upon the content that needs to be learned. Too often, the instructor is viewed by the student as the individual who controls all knowledge of the content, regularly dispenses it, and expects the students to understand quickly. When the emphasis is placed upon the person doing the learning rather than so much upon what is to be learned, the student cannot help but profit.

Several teaching techniques are observable in successful developmental teachers' classrooms. Classroom discussion methods of teaching are effective *if* all those in the classroom can participate. The emphasis here is upon the involvement of the student. Passive learning occurs rarely; active learning is the basis of an effective instructional design. The instructor evidences a willingness to listen to the student and to do so without making value judgments. He encourages student participation and reinforces it. In effect, instructors design ways in which students can succeed; they "structure" class sessions in ways so that students cannot avoid having some successful experiences. It is in the formulation of these experiences that the first stages of self-concept improvement begin. Slowly the "structuring" can be redesigned or lessened in the hopes that the students' past experiences will provide sufficient emphasis to allow him to control some classroom experiences on his own.

To promote student involvement is a commitment made by a successful developmental teacher. The teacher cannot help but put a substantial part of himself into the teaching/learning process. His involvement,

however, does not limit itself to the classroom experience. There are many examples of college teachers who find that, rather than accepting almost routine high attrition rates, much is accomplished by calling upon — in a very physical way — the students who are absenting themselves from class. In effect, these instructors take it upon themselves to seek out that student, whether it be on campus or in his home. It is this direct communication, either by card, letter, phone call, or personal visit that serve to emphasize the teacher's care and concern for that student's well-being. This involvement on a personal visit level can be carried out very effectively by instructor as well as by peer counselor or peer tutor. The real issue here is that the instructor not lay all responsibility for a student's presence in his class upon the dean of students or the dean of registration. The intructor is responsible for the learning process. Part of that learning process is the recognition that the student is valued and is important to someone. A recognition of his absence in the form of some real effort on the part of the instructor, outside of completing the institution's required forms, will most certainly make a dramatic impact.

In effect, the personality of successful developmental instructors resembles that of the —

> kind of person who has been described by Abraham Maslov as self actualizing, by Karen Horney as self-realizing, by Gayle Privette as transcendent functioning, and by Carl Rogers as fully functioning. Other humanistic psychologists have described such healthy personalities as open to experience, democratic, accepting, understanding, caring, supporting, approving, loving, nonjudgmental. They tolerate ambiguity; their decisions come from within rather than without; they have a zest for life, for experiencing, for touching, tasting, feeling, knowing. They risk involvement; they reach out for experiences; they are not afraid to encounter others or themselves. They believe that man is basically good, and given the right conditions, will move in positive directions (O'Banion, 1971, p. 45).

Most of the developmental teachers in community colleges and universities today have been especially trained not only in their content field, but in instructional strategies (Roueche and Snow, 1977). While the extent and depth of training is unknown, they have been involved in training sessions aimed at the specifics of individualized instruction processes. They have become familiar with the motivational and attitudinal problems experienced by most nontraditional students, and they have been given some institutional support in their efforts to improve upon their own techniques for dealing with attitudes and motivational problems.

Only about one-third of the teachers involved with developmental students, however, have had any training in counseling techniques. Initially, most successful developmental teachers explained that they felt

real concerns for high-risk students and worked out of these concerns. They observed that the techniques they used in and out of the classroom came more often out of personality traits of their own (as they involved feelings for the high-risk student) than from any specific acquired skills. But, often, these instructors faced the criticism that they provided much tender loving care, but not nearly enough instruction. The instructors themselves often had some of these same feelings, but their overriding feeling was one of helplessness in the face of what must be done and the results of their efforts to do it.

Counselors

It is comforting to recognize that research data is beginning to describe a trend of counselors and teachers beginning to work together to share some of the techniques that they each know so well. It does appear that some institutions are making numerous efforts to combine the talents of these two groups and allow them, encourage them, to work together. A recent study has found that less than 30 percent of the developmental teachers are provided any special in-service training to work with these high-risk students (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Yet, if the institution has a commitment to the nontraditional student, then it owes the faculty working with these students every opportunity to learn to improve upon their instruction and their interaction with these students.

Staff development, or any other name which might be given to a professional growth effort, is indeed an institutional responsibility. A college hires an individual for his strengths, and it takes upon itself the responsibility of improving those strengths and strengthening the weaknesses that he brings with him to his position. Thus, staff development is not an institution's way of telling an instructor that the job he does is not a good one; rather, it is the institution's way of providing the instructor with the latest in information and instructional strategies that will allow him to do an even better job.

Cross reports that 61 percent of the community colleges responding to her survey said that most of their remedial teachers had some special training for work with unprepared students; 54 percent of these campuses were paying all expenses for attendance at off-campus conferences, workshops, etc. Only 27 percent, however, provided any on-campus in-service training for remedial instructors (Cross, 1976, p. 238).

It would stand to reason that the glaring need for additional training for developmental teachers should not be lightly passed over. And with the increasing amounts of information about personality/teaching characteristics of developmental teachers, the goals and objectives for targeting this training should be rather straightforward. It would also stand to reason that if colleges are assuming responsibility for student learning, then they should be willing to identify some competencies which are

necessary for employment and which should be developed during that employment. They should be able to define what they are attempting to do for the nontraditional student and should have a rationale for their choice of a specific program design. Successful developmental programs are being publicized and investigated, and the literature abounds with program characteristics. Effective designs and techniques are being identified, and colleges are encouraged to look at the characteristics and behavioral objectives of these programs and formulate successful programs of their own. It is within these behavioral objectives that competencies are identified. Colleges can isolate these competencies, incorporate them into their own programs and require them of their present and potential developmental teachers.

One strong indication resulting from observations of successful programs is that these competencies *have* been identified as teacher and counselor behaviors were studied. A present trend is that these teacher and counselor characteristics are becoming more interdependent. In effect, counselors now are found teaching developmental courses, and developmental instructors are found moving toward counseling roles. In effect, the roles of college counselors and teachers are beginning to merge as good teachers are counseling students, and good counselors are teaching. It is understandable that in institutions where the goals and objectives include both the academic and the personal, this blending could be expected. A clarity of goals and objectives does much to enhance interfacing and interdependency of role-relationships rather than encouraging strict, inflexible role patterns.

It is in the merging of counselors' and teachers' roles that individuals in those positions are called upon most heartily to accept the resultant challenges of these role changes. Indeed, it takes the type of individuals that O'Banion has described earlier to accept this new trend. The counseling-teaching commitment is a team setting; the setting is one in which the student is the center of concern. Counselors and instructors who value each other's orientations toward their original interests will go far to develop a strong, healthy team approach. However, it is most important that those involved in this change pattern must possess "not only diagnostic or conceptual knowledge but technical skills in the design and delivery of a therapeutic learning environment" (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Thus it is that the staff selection should be most committed to the choosing of individuals whose interests and commitments are to professional growth and development and to possessing and improving upon their technical skills in both counseling and instruction.

The institution's commitment to the improvement of student learning techniques and strategies is effectively seen when the staff development to which it makes the commitment is an ongoing one. The development efforts should be instructive in nature, facilitative of sharing and reflective of evaluation. In other words, staff development should offer the

latest information about new techniques, it should encourage faculty members to interact and share particularly successful and particularly unsuccessful attempts that they have made to improve upon their techniques, and it should serve as an ongoing process of program evaluation.

A recent survey has discovered several characteristics about successful developmental programs: (1) they are characterized by instructors who chose their assignment; (2) training in instruction had assisted community college instructors more than senior college instructors; (3) training in counseling for both senior and community college instructors was directly related to the college's assistance in helping high-risk students to complete their work successfully (Roueche and Snow, 1977). The overall finding was that in-service training, for both senior and community college instructors, did make a difference and that colleges did accept the responsibility to provide this training.

Teaching faculty who are selected for developmental programs should be those individuals who profess an interest in working with the nontraditional student, who are experienced in their content area, and who can envision some specifically individual ways in which they will "go the second mile" toward overcoming their students' deficiencies. They should be able to converse about a variety of instructional techniques that they would employ to remedy or overcome these deficiencies and be able to cite programs or research that would support the effectiveness of these techniques. As data would present it, most instructors presently have not been trained in self-concept development techniques; however, the potential instructors who would acknowledge the importance of reinforcing positive student self-concept and would admit a willingness and an excitement about being involved in learning some counseling techniques designed to effect self-concept improvement are good candidates for these positions. Once the individual is hired, the institution takes over as the support agency.

Part of the support an institution can provide to its faculty members is to provide a strong counseling contingency. The selection of counselors should be based upon the awareness that there are several new roles in today's college for these individuals. In fact, Roueche and Snow discovered that more than 50 percent of the time, community college counselors are attached to developmental courses (1977). It is strongly suggested that developmental counselors, particularly those attached to these courses, should be specially trained and selected to function in the role of facilitator between student learning and student "personhood" development. The study discovered that in both senior and community colleges the high-risk student improved his performance when: (1) counselors were especially trained in developing the potential of high-risk students, (2) they were selected on the basis of competency-criteria, (3) the teaching of human development and consultation in the learning envi-

ronment were part of the counselor's role (Roueche and Snow, 1977). It is true, however, that the newer roles of instruction and consultation for counselors are not discovered as frequently in senior institutions as they are in community colleges. Roueche and Snow also found that community college developmental counselors instruct more often than they consult, instructing 37 percent of their time and consulting 31 percent (1977).

Similar to instructor personality traits, counselors should be those individuals who express interest in working with the high-risk students, who envision these students as valuable human beings whose potential ought to be developed, and who are flexible in their willingness to serve dual roles in this educational process. Cross reports that her survey indicated 57 percent of the community colleges employed counselors as teacher-counselors, and that the use of the group interaction or group counseling was at the 51 percent level (Cross, 1976, p. 237). The trend, therefore, apparently reflects that counselors are required to have some teaching skill, that they have developed some techniques for working with high-risk students, and that they have either a working knowledge or a willingness to develop some self-concept improvement counseling techniques.

If the counselor's role is essentially a facilitative one — aiding the student in accepting his responsibility for his own education and interacting with the instructors to encourage student support efforts — then the effect is a "team" enterprise. At several colleges, developmental education is approached as a "team" enterprise with every team listing at least one professional counselor as a member of its group. The counselor is not referred to as "a counselor." Rather he is considered merely another key member of the team. As a result of his presence and interaction with the other team members, the counselor does not perform traditional counseling roles. It is most likely then that students of these institutions are receiving continuing guidance and counseling and could not differentiate between the counseling they receive from faculty and that from the counselor himself (Roueche and Kirk, 1973).

A counselor, overall, must give the student every indication that his achievement and success is as important to the counselor as it is to the student's instructor. The counselor must encourage the student to accept more responsibility for his own learning and development while giving him the guidance and support that he is seeking, particularly in his initial college experiences. The counseling role should not be limited to dispensing information about transfer requirements, filling out financial aid forms, or meeting registration schedules. It is, rather, a supportive effort that undergirds the teaching-learning process. Research has held that successful developmental programs have a counseling component built into them.

Peer Counselors and Tutors

A recent trend in the counseling component is the use of peer counselors and peer tutors. (Previously, the role of the peer tutor has been discussed; therefore, present comments will be restricted to the peer counseling role.) Cross observes from the results of her survey that 39 percent of the community colleges surveyed are using students as counselors (Cross, 1976). It has long been realized that student-to-student contacts and influences are strong ones. The use of students in dealing with other students is a consistent effort with programming for successful completion of the developmental program. Recently there has been much research in the fields of education and in counseling psychology that has provided impetus for new interests in the peer counseling component. There are apparently two major philosophies which have developed concerning the utilization of peers as helpers. One group holds the philosophy that peer counselors should merely relieve professionals of their clerical or mundane chores but that their person-to-person activities should be highly restricted. Another group holds as its philosophy that peer counselors can be primary therapeutic delivery agents within the institution (Mink *et al*, 1976).

Whatever the major philosophical beliefs might be, it is evident that peer counseling has become a common practice in developmental/remedial programming. Roueche and Snow found that merely recruiting students to work in a peer counseling capacity did not necessarily improve the effectiveness of the group. However, those programs selecting peer counselors on the basis of certain observable, measurable criteria did improve upon the effectiveness of their programs. For example, El Centro College in Dallas recruited heavily from past developmental studies students as well as students who were merely interested in becoming peer counselors. These students were enrolled in a human development course, a particular course specifically designed to offer counseling techniques and to allow the counselor/instructor to make assessments of the potential peer counselors. At the end of the course, those students demonstrating behaviors meeting the previously agreed-upon criteria were selected as peer counselors. They were then slotted into peer counselor positions and were salaried for their work. The peer counseling program at this institution is an extremely successful one. The national data also observes that most successful senior college programs select on such agreed upon criteria in 100 percent of their programs (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Peer counselor training methods vary widely. Because those counselors who normally train peer counselors are grounded in the counseling tradition that has developed over the years, they reflect all the perspectives of the counseling tradition. Yet recently, the teaching of counseling skills to peer counselors appears to have shifted from a more traditional counsel-

ing pattern to reflect a rather systematic acquisition of certain interpersonal skills (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Research reports that counseling training, per se, was the least related peer counselor training variable to successful developmental programs. It does report, however, that self-concept development techniques *are* highly related to the peer counselors' effectiveness in working with the high-risk student. It is this finding that underscores the importance of the role for self-concept as it affects the high-risk student's success in higher education.

Initially, peer counselors were trained and employed as a result of manpower needs and of dealing with the new high-risk student. It is out of this initial demand for peer counselors that highly successful programs have found them to be a major integral part of a complete counseling/teaching program.

In summary, staffing a developmental program with strong faculty members, strong counselors, strong peer counselors, and peer tutors undergirds the institutional commitment of serving the high-risk student. It is an awareness of these staffing characteristics and their effect on the program design that can converge to promote success for the high-risk student. Counseling and instructional roles should not be separate. Instructors who are trained in counseling tehniques are more effective; also more effective are counselors who are trained in sound instructional techniques. Those counselors who are teaching human development courses and assisting faculty through consultation in their curriculum development are aiding in establishing a sound base for strong program design. It is also true that peer tutors and peer counselors who have received training in self-concept development techniques do affect significantly the success rates of developmental students. It seems that as roles begin to converge, and instructors, counselors, and peers join hands to work toward an end result of ultimate success for the student, an effective environment for learning will be produced.

If program end results are to be successful ones, then there must be an attempt to keep abreast of what is happening within the program. There should be some attempts on the part of the faculty and staff, as well as the peer group, to continue an ongoing and systematized program of evaluating where the program is and where it wants to go. It is the end result of continuing evaluation that provides the basis for good faculty and staff development programs.

At the risk of repetition, it should re-stated that staff development works not out of a perceived weakness but out of a perceived recognition that new techniques should be shared and existing ones should be strengthened. Staff development is a time of providing a renewal function in the organization; and though renewal is a necessary function of any organizaiton, in developmental studies programs one could say that it was even more so. Two possible outcomes, over and above the outcomes of improving upon present teaching/learning strategies, are (1) the role

models that such development efforts provide for high-risk students and (2) the experience of sharing concerns by individual instructors desiring group assistance. Staff development can give new life-blood to any organization. Most development studies personnel would be quick to admit that, on the one hand, their jobs are such that they need strong support from both their colleagues and their administrators. The teaching of the high-risk student is not a time-tested group of functions. The experiment in effective new approaches continues and a constant sharing of these new processes is of the utmost importance. It is in the sharing of concerns, joys, and fears that a solid program is developed and welded together.

CHAPTER V

KNITTING IT ALL TOGETHER

If community colleges are to uphold the belief that they are "democracy's college" and if four-year colleges and universities are to remain accountable to those groups who have expressed disenchantment with the results of higher education, they must make good on their commitments to provide useful education. If colleges are to provide such education, rather than to design means to eliminate some individuals from the educational process, they must be active in developing techniques to meet diverse student needs. And, if colleges and universities are to remain financially viable, they must seek to provide enrollment (1) for those students for whom college was never a plan, and (2) for those students who are college aspirants — high school graduates — under-prepared to successfully manage college work. Trends indicate that colleges and universities are making efforts to meet the diverse needs of the new students.

No college curriculum has grown as rapidly over the past six years as has the developmental education curriculum (Roueche and Snow, 1977). What this trend says, in effect, is that many four-year colleges and universities are currently practicing an open-door philosophy whether or not they actually admit it in print. Their policies support such implementation. Therefore, it is evident that the community colleges are no longer the only open-door for postsecondary education; this recent development means that all institutions of higher education are now accepting problems of student diversity and making efforts to respond positively.

It is the effort of "responding positively" that makes a sound developmental studies program reflect good sense on the part of faculty and administrators. Perhaps the strongest belief about a successful developmental studies program is that the program be an integral part of the institution's effort to provide education for all students. The developmental effort should be merely another component of an already multifaceted institution. It should not be regarded as a step-child to a larger, more important or worthwhile operation. Rather, developmental education is obviously here to serve a dramatically impressive need. To ignore the need is disastrous to any institution of higher education; to ignore the implementation of a good developmental program designed to meet this need would be yet another.

PART II
PROGRAM EVALUATION

CHAPTER VI

DATA AND PERSONNEL ESSENTIAL TO PROGRAM EVALUATION

Historically, colleges and universities have done little to evaluate their performances. However, the increasing attention by the public and by professionals demanding accountability from all schools and colleges is on the increase. As a result, evaluation efforts are being designed and implemented. Although the trend speaks strongly that evaluation is on the upswing, the evaluative reports are often inconsistent because diverse and conflicting criteria are being utilized in the judgments of results. As a result, most evaluation has been sharply critcized, primarily the evaluation of developmental programs. Roueche, in 1968, found little research being done to measure the effectiveness of remedial programs. By 1973, Roueche and Kirk discovered that a few colleges were loudly proclaiming their efforts to have high-risk students succeed, that they were convinced that they could provide the success, and that they were willing and able to demonstrate their efforts.

Unfortunately, most programs in 1973 were continuing to merely mouth that their efforts were good ones, but they were not making any efforts to put their theories to the test. In fact, Tinto observed that most evaluative studies "tend to demonstrate some overall intervention success in recruiting and keeping disadvantaged students in collge; they, however, do not adequately describe or explain the factors which contribute to this situation" (Tinto, 1974, p. 52). Continuing, Gordon observed that: "Collegiate compensatory programs have failed to document the *design* as well as *implementation*" (Gordon, 1975, p. 15). In effect the programs involved in our evaluations have not given specific enough detail about the methods they are using to achieve success nor have they determined which of the factors (student, program, or staff) contributed to that success or that failure. Too often, Gordon found that the programs produced descriptive rather than evaluative materials, and the end result was much disappointment on the parts of faculty and administrators involved in the project.

Roueche and Snow's recent study (1977) suggests that the outlook for evaluation looks promising, even progressive. The institutions including evaluative documents in their responses often cited the use of control groups as a technique to study the impact of selected interventions in the educational process. Also, it was found often that plans were in the making to remedy the needs identified in the evaluation reports. The date

received from colleges still lacking any system for evaluation of their developmental programs was that they were gearing up to institute such evaluation systems. The trend, therefore, appears to suggest that progress is being made in the efforts toward evaluation.

Historically, evaluation has never been a pleasant, eagerly-anticipated event. By tradition, the evaluation of one's performance has been more associated with identifying the weaknesses in that performance than identifying the strengths. Evaluation, however, is actually nothing more than "a method of reorganizing resources to accomplish an objective" (Roueche and Snow, 1977, Chapter IV).

Klein, Fenstermacher and Alkin describe evaluation as: "The process of (1) determining the kinds of decisions that have to be made; (2) selecting, collecting, and analyzing information needed and making these decisions; and (3) the reporting of this information to appropriate decision-makers" (Klein *et al,* 1971, p.9). Obviously, then, the individual seeking to evaluate developmental programs must consider many student input variables, situational variables, program variables, and output variables. The consideration of multiple variables will present a more accurate picture than will a small, only partial picture (Wright, 1975).

Data Utilized

Effective evaluation of developmental education must embody an entire assessment of all the student's experiences. It must obviously be concerned with skill changes in students. The skills to be assessed should be more than the cognitive skills; rather, the evaluation should incorporate assessment of the student's interpersonal skills. Northcutt *et al* envision Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives (affective, cognitive, psychomotor) as translating into four general skill areas: (1) communications skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening), (2) computation skill (3) problem-solving skills, and (4) interpersonal skills (Northcutt *et al,* 1975).

These student skills can be measured through pre/post-assessments in courses, through student feedback about their feelings relating to college experiences, through non-obtrusive measures such as the retention/attrition records, grade point averages, and units attempted and completed. In effect, the student's verbal behavior is to be observed as closely as any one, two or three separate facets of his academic behavior.

Successful developmental programs are most often found evaluating their efforts and using more indices on which to make these evaluations. In effect, the more successful colleges differ from the least successful developmental programs in that they base their evaluation systems on traditional educational measures, combining them with assessments of student attitude and self-concept changes. Their evaluation designs are

more often well-planned than are they last-minute attempts to evaluate. Roueche and Snow noted that community colleges more often engage in evaluation efforts than do senior colleges on all of the previously-noted criteria. In fact, in 85 percent of the community colleges sampled, there were evaluation systems in effect; however, in only 67 percent of the senior colleges were there such systems (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Roueche and Snow also found that the more successful colleges (those with high student completion) made more use of follow-up records, attitudinal measures, self-concept measures, and pre-post testing than did the less successful programs.

The incorporation of a control or contrast group design appears in few programs. Strong reactions to the establishment of such control or contrast groups come as a result of (1) the difficulties in the development of such groups, and/or (2) the understandable commitment to providing as much service as possible to as many students as possible. However, when the evaluation is well-designed and is built into the program, these concerns are reduced somewhat. In effect, the control or contrast groups can be used to compare results among students who leave the program early, students who elect not to choose developmental studies programs, and developmental students enrolled in a previous semester's work.

Asking the right question leads to strong evaluation and assessment measures. Some good questions to ask about the success or failure of the developmental program are:

> What percent of your students have completed the developmental studies program?
>
> What percent of your students persisted to a second semester, a third semester, or completed a certificate program at your institution?

There should also be some design for analyzing changes in cognitive and affective domains. Evaluators should use effective measures to pre- and post-test for skill development and to pre-and post-test for student attitude toward their learning experience. A most effective way to evaluate what a program is doing is to first make certain that the course goals and objectives have been formulated and pre-stated to the student. If indeed, then, the student can evidence solid achievement of these pre-stated goals and objectives, then an effective evaluation effort has been made. Such self-concept and attitudinal measures are found in attitude-assessment instruments which are administered to determine present attitudes toward the learning experience.

The traditional criterion of performance in studies of scholastic achievement has been the student's grade (Lavin, 1965). This fact is not to suggest that grades are the only criterion of this achievement. Understandably, many educators have voiced considerable concern about the over-emphasis on grades as indicators of academic success; however, grades are an important index of this performance, and thus performance

evaluations do include the grade point average of the developmental student.

It stands to reason that over time the data on retention/attrition records would be a more valid indicator of college success than would the GPA. Prediger writes:

> In light of the drop-out problem in our colleges and universities, it seems appropriate that more attention be paid to persistence in college as a criterion of success. Ultimately, the student's success in college is judged not in terms of his GPA but, rather, in terms of the educational program which he has completed (Prediger, 1965, p. 2).

Roueche and Snow found that as the percentage of students who completed the developmental studies program increased, so did their reported eventual completion of a certificate program. The same relationship was found in both senior and community colleges between the persistence to the third semester of college and completion in a certificate program. The same relationship was found in both senior and community colleges between the persistence to the third semester of college and completion in a certificate program. In effect, high retention and successful completion of developmental programs provided evidence of the theory that success on that level would indicate success in subsequent courses would most likely follow. The obvious qualifying factors would be the success of the program (1) in preparing students for these subsequent courses, and (2) for providing them with abilities to transfer the skills and learning patterns developed in their basic work into regular college courses.

Whatever methods of evaluation will produce information that an institution feels is necessary to mark success or lack of it should be the result of careful design and planning. The data to be used in careful evaluation should include at least attrition/retention records; grade point averages of the students; and analysis of both cognitive and affective changes in the student's skill patterns, through the use of pre- and post-test results and self-concept/attitudinal assessment measures. In addition, a systematic program evaluation should include a battery of well-kept follow-up records. These records should reflect what occurs to a student once he leaves the developmental program — they should record his success in subsequent college work (grades), whether or not he completes a two- or a four-year college program, his on-the-job success, and his ability to transfer work to other institutions and complete programs there. Such follow-up records should be a fairly global picture of the student's academic and personal skill developmental program of which he is a part.

Evaluation Participants

Systematic evaluation is at the heart of any strong programmatic endeavor. Evaluation helps educators apprise themselves of existing needs and the extent to which those needs are being addressed. So little is known about the design of successful programs that there are few absolutes with which to deal. Therefore, there should be documentation of those activities which are working, those which have not been successful, and those which yet remain to be investigated. Finally, decisions must be made about the results of the efforts and whether or not the efforts should be continued, revised, or terminated. With such systematic evaluation, administrators and faculty can anticipate many of the changes that must be made in the continual revision process and plan for the changes that must be made. This anticipation and planning will enhance the control that individuals will have over the developmental program's success.

All participants of the developmental effort should be involved in the evaluation process. Indeed, if the institution proposes a strong commitment to the program, then each of those persons making that commitment should be aware that evaluation is occurring and should demand to see its results. For example, the chief academic officer or the president of the institution should have a solid role in the evaluation efforts. He should have a clear idea of the pre-stated goals and objectives for the program, and he should be apprised of the results of the evaluation report upon these goals and objectives at program's end. In most instances, the director of the developmental studies program (or the individual in charge, depending upon the program design) should have evaluation data ready to present the president at any given time. This director should also be capable of matching program, specific course, and specific instructor against the criteria by which those programs, courses, or instructors are being evaluated. The director should be able to make a sound judgment about the effectiveness of the teaching environment and learning processes and include this information in his report to the chief academic officer. His evaluation efforts can be observational, can be ascertained in person-to-person interviews with the instructor and students involved in the program, and can be formulated from his receiving answers to good questions about what is going on in the program. "What is going on in the program" can be best defined by using — as the criteria — the data sought in examples of good evaluation designs.

Both the institution's general faculty and the developmental program's faculty should be involved in an evaluation effort. On the one hand, the general faculty, who are in receipt of the developmental student once he leaves the developmental program, would serve as effective judges of the quality of the developmental program. Their input into the re-design or redirection of certain aspects of the program would be invaluable. On the

other hand, the developmental faculty are aware on a firsthand basis of the common problems or difficulties as well as the success experiences that they have had. Through their involvement with nontraditional students, they can effectively make some judgments about their own work. Those judgments can be made against pre-stated criteria for the assessment of effective teaching; they also can be made against some personal criteria that might have been shared in the past with a division officer or with someone in charge of the developmental program.

The question is often raised as to whether or not students ought to be allowed to have a voice in evaluating the program and the staff. Those individuals who would advocate a participatory form of college governance favor student input into many of the decision-making processes (Richardson, Blocker, and Bender, 1972). Individuals who would restrict the decision-making to the adminsitrative hierarchy would suggest that the students' involvement and influence in decision-making be minimized (Stroup, 1966; Helling, 1975).

It makes good sense that those most affected by the teaching-learning process should have a voice in responding to the level of effectiveness of that program. The substantive issues that underlie students' evaluation of staff and college are mostly concerned with the reliability and the validity of the instruments being used. However, valid and reliable instruments are in existence. Eagle (1975) identifies several faculty evaluating surveys. Eagle cites one instrument developed at the University of California (Davis), which discriminates between the "best" instructors and the "worst" as rated by both faculty and students. Studies, furthermore, have shown that a positive relationship exists between student ratings of their instructors and student learning. Apparently, this relationship goes far beyond the student's attraction for the instructor as another human being, as that is only one of the many important factors that can be studied in this faculty evaluation survey.

Many institutions have found themselves in need of a workable assessment instrument — an instrument designed to measure the student's attitude toward his instructor and the program of which he is a part. As a result, many institutions are turning to homemade devices — devices which ask questions the college would like to have answered. The questions can be very forthright, very honest; they can quickly ascertain whether or not the student is pleased or displeased with what is happening to him and can be simultaneously used as a pre- and a post-assessment instrument. Instructors and administrators also need input to evaluation of effectiveness of their program's design and their teaching strategies. This recommendation is underscored by current evidence that student evaluation of instructors is in common practice now. However, new research documents that there appears to be no relationship between the practice of students evaluating their instructors with the college's success with such students (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

The possibility exists that students' evaluations suffer from the criticism mentioned previously, that of invalidated instruments and a failure to incorporate the evaluation system into the decision-making process.

An interesting phenomenon is that colleges more often can validate their own instruments in the area of student evaluation of peer helpers (counselors and tutors). Snow observes that "the turnover rate of peer helpers is high enough to make student evaluation at this level valuable in developing effectiveness criteria for selection and training" (Snow *et al*, 1975).

Student evaluation of counselors incorporates many of the same problem areas that are found in instructor evaluation. Roueche and Kirk (1973), Truax and Carkhuff (1967), and Carkhuff (1969, 1971) have all criticized the evaluation of counseling. They have done so on the basis that counseling has relatively vague goals and that its methods are arbitrary and are questionably successful. These same individuals, however, are quick to note that a counselor who is particularly skillful in certain core skills, who has a clear picture of the results he is attempting to effect, and who modifies his counseling methods by observing effective methods is more likely to make a constructive difference in the counseling evaluation process. In 1967, Truax and Carkhuff developed a research-based relationship questionnaire; this questionnaire can be effectively used as a criterion-based assessment instrument for evaluating performance of counselors. Investigations by Rector (1970) and Snow (1973) show this instrument to be highly related to the counselor's ability to affect student growth in individual and group settings. Roueche and Snow (1977) indicate that successful colleges can be differentiated from their less-successful counterparts by the incorporation of student evaluation of counselors. One can only speculate as to the reasons for this finding. Perhaps the colleges adopting the practice of student evaluation of counselors may closely respond to all student feedback and follow such recommendations in staff selection, assignment, and training practices.

Other student evaluation is assessment of student perceptions of the college's environment. Pace (1962) developed the College and University Environment Scale (CUES) for use in the four-year college setting. The American College Testing Service has very recently developed a related Student Reaction to College (SRC) instrument for use in the community college level. Presently the SRC is being used in a research effort with Texas community colleges to assess the impacts of institutional climate, instruction, and counseling on the persistence and achievement of high-risk students (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Current research indicates that if a student is allowed to assess the college environment, he will provide valuable information useful in reducing the undesirable and increasing the desirable aspect of that environment.

When questions are asked of administrators, staff, and students to ascertain how these individuals would like to see the college environment

changed or continued, the college or university community itself helps to set priorities for a change. Thus, an assessment of environmental factors is an important effort to make in designing a therapeutic learning environment.

Other evaluation participants that should be involved in good evaluation procedures are evaluators outside the institution. These evaluators can be representatives from colleges and universities receiving developmental students (whether or not students completed only the developmental courses, several semesters of course work, or attained degrees at the senior institution conducting the evaluation). Feedback from those who have contact with the student after he leaves the college provides solid information for program revision and improvement. Too, on-the-job contacts should be included. Employers who have former developmental students in their businesses serve as excellent evaluators of the student's present ability to handle his present job functions. Frequently, process and product evaluation can best be accomplished by an outside educational evaluation consultant.

Once evaluation has been conducted, data should not be kept secret. Pooling evaluation reports and actively disseminating them are absolute necessities. Practices can be compared with other traditional and innovative practices and results should be shared. Through the measurement of change by intellectual and social assessment, we can isolate some particularly useful educational outcomes. Documentation of comparisons between students who followed the developmental studies path and those who did not serves to keep an honest atmosphere about what is truly happening in developmental programs.

Evaluation efforts are best reinforced and serve to promote similar evaluations in other programs when reports of results are publicized. The criticism that colleges and universities prefer not to evaluate their own efforts for fear they are doing nothing cannot be allowed to continue. In this day of constant concern about accountability, a lack of evaluation is inexcusable. The trend is to involve as many participants in the evaluation process as is economically and logistically feasible. And more importantly, these evaluation efforts should be shared for program improvement. The importance of sharing information with those who make decisions about developmental programs is not to be understated. Individuals who make decisions should always be "in the know" about the activities of the programs over which they have authority. A first priority for those who have the necessary information is to provide relevant data to those in such decision-making positions.

CHAPTER VII

AN EVALUATION DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION*

Introduction

In constructing this survey instrument, the designers have kept two purposes in mind. First, it allows you to engage in a self-assessment of your efforts by systematically comparing the present state of your program against what you would like it to be. Second, we have only preliminary data on the variety of shapes and forms by which successful learning climates are characterized. Further information which contrasts what is working, what is desirable, and what is not desirable can only add to the "state of knowledge" of developmental programs.

Directions

For most questions on this instrument you are only to circle or check either *yes* (1) or *no* (2). A few questions ask you to circle the extent of a quality on a Likert scale (4—1), and others to rank your responses from (l to n).

You are asked to respond to each question in two different ways: First — what is your current practice? Then — in your judgment, what should your practice be? That is, what is *actually* taking place and what should *ideally* be taking place.

An *ideal* permits you to function as your own contrast group. You may view each item as a potential target for change, or each subsection as an overall assessment of one general area. In total the questionnaire can be used to evaluate a college's efforts at assisting high-risk students to succeed.

You might choose to have only the director of the program, or his equivalent, complete the assignment. However, the instrument can also be used by a task group which works toward consensus on the actual and ideal, or by different levels of concerned persons, i.e., administrators, instructors, counselors, peer helpers, students, etc.

---

*Developed by John E. Roueche and Jerry J. Snow, The University of Texas at Austin.

Scoring

The instrument has been designed (1) to facilitate in extracting information directly from the questionnaire by keypunch operators, and (2) to facilitate hand-scoring by the respondent. Each subsection has a provision for indicating the number of questions which you answered affirmatively for your *actual* and *ideal* practices. Add these affirmative responses together to obtain your subsection score. For each "yes" answer, count one affirmative response; for each 3 or 4 on the 4—1 scale, count one response; and for each item checked on an open ranking count one response.

To obtain your *difference* score merely subtract the actual from the ideal (A - I = D). By then dividing the total number of *scorable items* in that subsection by the *difference score*, you obtain a quantity reflecting the strength of the difference. The size of this proportion can be viewed as an indication of the priority which this particular area has to the respondent. We speculate that the wider the gap between *actual* and *ideal* the greater the tension created within the college related to this area. By adding each of the subsections together, overall scores can be obtained. That is *overall actual affirmative, ideal affirmative, difference* and *proportion*.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

A. CONTEXT

1. Name of your college _____ State _____

2. Is your college: (1) Rural _____, (2) Suburban _____, or (3) Inner City _____

3. Approximately how many students are enrolled at your institution:

   a) less than 2,000 _____
   b) between 2,001 & 6,000 _____
   c) between 6,001 & 10,000 _____
   d) between 10,001 & 15,000 _____
   e) between 15,001 & 20,000 _____
   f) more than 20,000 _____

4. What does your institution charge for student tuition and fees with 15 semester hours (or equivalent):

   a) below $25 _____
   b) $26 - $50 _____
   c) $51 - $75 _____
   d) $76 - $100 _____
   e) $101 - $200 _____
   f) $201 - $300 _____
   g) $301 - $400 _____
   h) $401 - $500 _____
   i) $501 - $700 _____
   j) $701 - $900 _____
   k) $901 - $1,100 _____
   l) over $1,200 _____

5. Has your institution:	ACTUAL Yes	ACTUAL No	IDEAL Yes	IDEAL No
*a) Developed courses which could be classified as remedial or developmental?	1	2	1	2
*b) Developed special services, e.g. tutoring, counseling, financial aids, for those who are academically disadvantaged?	1	2	1	2
*c) Developed a special program for the academically disadvantaged?	1	2	1	2
*d) Developed alternatives other than *a* to *c* for meeting the needs of high-risk students?	1	2	1	2

CONTEXT: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*4*) *

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

If your answers to a, b, c, & d were all NO, please fold this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided. If not, please continue.

B. PHILOSOPHY

*1. To what extent has your college implemented the "open door"?

	completely			not at all		completely			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*2. Do you agree that 90% of all students can learn at a mastery level what you are teaching, if they are given sufficient time and appropriate help?

	agree			disagree		agree			disagree
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*3. Is there a written statement describing your developmental philosophy which is distributed to students?

	good statement		none			good statement		none	
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*4. Are there written learning objectives which are distributed to students?

	usually		never			usually			never
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

PHILOSOPHY: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*4*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

C. RATIONALE

1. Is the developmental/remedial program:

*a. To develop academic survival skills, e.g. study skills, reading, writing, memory, etc.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*b. To develop the students' self-concept, e.g. self-esteem, confidence, level of aspiration, achievement motivation, etc.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*c. To prepare students for regular college work.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*d. To develop skills which are related to job and family responsibilities.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*e. To change your present college's response to high-risk students.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

2. Does your program: (Rank order, using a *1* for the most important, a *2* for the next most important, etc.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Encourage students to select a transfer program?	____	____
b. Encourage students to select a vocational/technical program?	____	____
c. Encourage students to select a program of study based on their own interests regardless of career opportunities?	____	____
d. Provide little direction as to future plans?	____	____

RATIONALE: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*5*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

D. RECRUITMENT

1. Does your college conduct an assessment of your service areas' educational needs by:

*a. Use of a current student data base, i.e. identifying groups who are under-represented, special interests of current students or special needs of current students?

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*b. Use of a community survey?

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*c. Household interviews?

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*d. Community advisory groups?

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

2. Are efforts made to recruit students who would not normally seek higher education, e.g. persons from lower socio-economic groups, minorities and the elderly?

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

3. What are the primary methods your college uses to recruit new students? (Rank order)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Local newspapers	____	____
b. Mailouts to high school seniors	____	____
c. Mailouts to every household	____	____
d. Visits to local high schools	____	____
e. T.V. advertisements	____	____
f. Radio advertisements	____	____
g. Distribution of materials at shopping malls, fairs, etc.	____	____
h. Visits to local agencies, e.g. church groups, welfare agencies, community centers, etc.	____	____
i. Other (Please specify) _____		

RECRUITMENT: SELF-SCORING. Number of items (5)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

E. ADMISSIONS AND PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS

1. For new students attending your college for the first time, what records do you require? (Check the appropriate blank.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Transcripts of previous educational experiences	____	____
b. Test scores	____	____
c. Demographic data sheet	____	____
d. Valid identification	____	____
e. Other (Please specify) _____	____	____
*TOTAL	____	____

2. Please *rank* the following placement methods you use in placing students into developmental courses or programs. (Rank order, using a *1* for the most important and a *2* for the next most important, etc.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Student self-referral	____	____
b. Testing	____	____
c. Previous educational record	____	____
d. Counseling	____	____
e. Teacher referral	____	____
f. Other (Please specify) _____	____	____

*3. Do you offer diagnostic testing or assessment services?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

*a. Are they required for admission?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

4. What tests do you commonly use for diagnostic/placement purposes? (Rank according to frequency used.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. A.C.T.	____	____
b. S.A.T.	____	____
c. Nelson Denny Reading Test	____	____
d. Stanford Achievement Test	____	____
e. McGraw-Hill Series	____	____
f. Comparative Guidance and Placement Test	____	____
g. A Self-Concept Test	____	____
h. A personality test	____	____
i. Locally designed tests	____	____
j. Other (Please specify) _____	____	____
*TOTAL	____	____

*5. Are your developmental courses mandatory?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

*6. Are your developmental courses optional?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

7. What do you see as the major obstacles to academic success for high-risk students? Rank order.

a. ___ Low intelligence
b. ___ Poor home background
c. ___ Lack of effort; has quit trying
d. ___ Lack of interest in academic matters
e. ___ Outside commitments, such as work, dating, sports, etc., prevent adequate time and energy for study.

ADMISSIONS AND PLACEMENT: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*6*)*

Actual Affirmative ___
Ideal Affirmative ___
Difference ___

F. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

1. Which *one* of the following descriptions best represents your present developmental studies organizational structure?

a. ___ The addition of *isolated* developmental *courses* in discipline curricula, i.e. adding developmental reading to the list of approved courses in English.
b. ___ The addition of *courses* in disciplines which are highly supportive of developmental efforts.
c. ___ Working with an *interdisciplinary group of instructors* who remain attached to their disciplines organizationally, but who cooperate with instructors from other disciplines and with counselors attached to these courses.
d. ___ Establishment of an *academic division or department* of developmental studies which plans, coordinates and allocates funds for instruction, counseling and other support services.
e. ___ Establishment of a *Learning Resources Center* which provides territory, diagnostic assistance and other supportive assistance with academic courses.
f. ___ Other (Please specify) _____

2. Given your college setting, rank order these six structures:

a) ___ b) ___ c) ___ d) ___ e) ___ f) ___

3. Describe an ideal organizational structure for developmental studies on your campus.

_____

_____

_____

_____

G. SUPPORT SERVICES

Financial Aids

*1. Does your institution have a financial aid program?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

If so, is it characterized by:	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal No
*a. Administrative personnel	___	___	___	___
*b. Counselors	___	___	___	___
*c. Financial aid designed especially for disadvantaged students	___	___	___	___
*d. Allocations based on need regardless of academic standing, e.g. student may retain award while on probation	___	___	___	___
*e. "Need" used as major criterion of eligibility for funds	___	___	___	___
*f. The college has funds of its own which are used for poorly prepared students	___	___	___	___
*g. Participation in:				
*BEOG program	___	___	___	___
*Federally Insured Loans	___	___	___	___
*Work-Study Grants	___	___	___	___
*State Loan Programs	___	___	___	___

h. What is your total loan dollar award for this academic year? _____

i. What do you think it reasonably should be? _____

FINANCIAL AIDS: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*12*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

Learning Assistance Center

*2. Does your institution have a Learning Assistance Center?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ IDEAL: (1) Yes ___ (2) No ___

If so, is it characterized by:	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal No
*a Instructional Staff	___	___	___	___
*1) Full-time professionals	___	___	___	___

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*2) Part-time professionals	___	___	___	___
*3) Para-professionals	___	___	___	___
*4) Peer tutors	___	___	___	___
*5) Teaching interns	___	___	___	___
*b. Counseling staff	___	___	___	___
*1) Full-time professionals	___	___	___	___
*2) Part-time professionals	___	___	___	___
*3) Para-professionals	___	___	___	___
*4) Peer counselors	___	___	___	___
*5) Counseling interns	___	___	___	___
c. An administrative and budgetary relationship to:				
*1) Academic services	___	___	___	___
*2) Student services	___	___	___	___

LEARNING ASSISTANCE CENTER: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*15*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

Additional Support Services	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*3. Does your college have a media production center?	___	___	___	___
*4. Does your college provide audio-visual support?	___	___	___	___
*5. Does your college have a day care center?	___	___	___	___
*a. Is it a lab school for a child development program?	___	___	___	___
*b. Is it open during the evening?	___	___	___	___

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*5*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

H. INSTRUCTION

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Are your developmental/remedial courses characterized by:				
*a. Non-credit	___	___	___	___
*b. Nondegree credit	___	___	___	___
*c. Degree credit	___	___	___	___
*d. Full term in length	___	___	___	___
*e. Less than full term	___	___	___	___

	Actual		Ideal	
2. Are your developmental/remedial practices characterized by:	Yes	No	Yes	No
*a. Providing students with course goals and objectives at the beginning of term?	___	___	___	___
*b. Providing at least two alternate learning activities for each learning objective?	___	___	___	___
*c. Providing a variety of assessment methods; other than pencil and paper?	___	___	___	___
*d. Test items which are developed from pre-stated objectives?	___	___	___	___
*e. Information is gathered on the students' opinion of the methods employed in the course which is used in revising instructional activities.	___	___	___	___
*f. Students are allowed to restudy unmastered source objectives and retake tests to attain mastery.	___	___	___	___
*3. Do high-risk students carry a lighter academic load than "traditional" students?	___	___	___	___
*4. Is there an attempt made by your college to promote non-punitive grading; e.g. pass-no-pass?	___	___	___	___
*5. Are developmental/remedial courses smaller than regular courses?	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTION: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*14*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

I. STAFFING

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Are instructors in developmental courses:				
*a. Representative of the general faculty in experience, training and effectiveness	___	___	___	___
*1) more	___	___	___	___
*2) less	___	___	___	___
*b. Specially trained in instructional techniques which enable them to work with diverse students.	___	___	___	___
*c. Specially trained in counseling techniques.	___	___	___	___
*d. Specially trained in self-concept development techniques.	___	___	___	___
*e. Selected on the basis of competency criteria.	___	___	___	___
*f. Evaluated by students.	___	___	___	___

*2. How effective are your instructors in causing learning in high-risk students?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*3. Do you have any special instructional or training programs to assist your faculty to work with high-risk students?	___	___	___	___
*4. Are counselors attached to developmental courses or programs? If so, are they:				
*a. Selected on the basis of competency criteria?	___	___	___	___
*b. Specially trained in developing the potential of high-risk students?	___	___	___	___
*c. Specially trained in self-concept development techniques?	___	___	___	___
*d. Co-instructors in developmental courses?	___	___	___	___
*e. Consultants in curriculum development?	___	___	___	___
*f. Instructors of human development courses?	___	___	___	___
*g. Working with students in group interaction?	___	___	___	___
*h. Working with students in one-to-one counseling?	___	___	___	___
*i. Evaluated by students?	___	___	___	___

*5. How effective are your developmental counselors in developing the potential of high risk students?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

6. Are regular institutional counselors:				
*a. Selected on the basis of competency criteria?	___	___	___	___
*b. Specially trained in developing the potential of high-risk students?	___	___	___	___
*c. Specially trained in self-concept development techniques?	___	___	___	___
*d. Consultants in curriculum development?	___	___	___	___
*e. Instructors of human development courses?	___	___	___	___
*f. Working with students in group interaction?	___	___	___	___
*g. Evaluated by students?	___	___	___	___
*7. Are counselors provided any special instructional or training programs to assist them in working with high-risk students?	___	___	___	___

*8. How effective are your regular counselors in developing the potential of high-risk students?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*9. Do you utilize peer tutors in assisting high-risk students with their academic work?	___	___	___	___
If so, are they:				
*a. Recruited?	___	___	___	___
*b. Selected on the basis of effectiveness criteria?	___	___	___	___
*c. Trained in teaching techniques?	___	___	___	___
*d. Trained in counseling techniques?	___	___	___	___
*e. Trained in self-concept development techniques?	___	___	___	___
*f. Trained in study skill techniques?	___	___	___	___
*g. Evaluated by staff or students?	___	___	___	___

*10. How effective are your tutors in assisting high-risk students with their academic work?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

*11. Do you utilize peer counselors in assisting high-risk students to develop their potential?	___	___	___	___
If so, are they:				
*a. Recruited?	___	___	___	___
*b. Selected on the basis of effectiveness criteria?	___	___	___	___
*c. Trained in teaching techniques?	___	___	___	___
*d. Trained in counseling techniques?	___	___	___	___
*e. Trained in self-concept development techniques?	___	___	___	___
*f. Evaluated by staff or students?	___	___	___	___

*12. How effective are your peer counselors in assisting high-risk students to develop their potential?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

STAFFING: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (*47*)*

Actual Affirmative ____
Ideal Affirmative ____
Difference ____

J. EVALUATION

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*1. Does your college evaluate developmental courses or programs in a systematic manner?	___	___	___	___

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
*2. Does your evaluation system utilize:				
*a. Retention/attrition records	___	___	___	___
*b. Analysis of grade point averages	___	___	___	___
*c. Follow-up records, e.g. grades in non-remedial courses, success in job or transfer, etc.	___	___	___	___
*d. Attitudinal measures, e.g. O.P.I., local tests, etc.	___	___	___	___
*e. Self-concept measures, e.g. Locus of Control scales, Tennessee Self-Concept Test, etc.	___	___	___	___
*f. Student perceptions of the college, e.g. Student Reaction to College, local tests, etc.	___	___	___	___
*g. Pre-, post-tests	___	___	___	___
*h. Control or contrast groups	___	___	___	___
*i. Comparison of achievements to pre-stated program objectives.	___	___	___	___
3. Who does the evaluating of your developmental/remedial programs or courses?				
*a. Faculty	___	___	___	___
*b. Academic Dean	___	___	___	___
*c. Director of Institutional Research	___	___	___	___
*d. Director of Developmental Studies	___	___	___	___
*e. Students in remedial programs	___	___	___	___
*f. Other college personnel	___	___	___	___
*g. Outside evaluator	___	___	___	___

4. Approximately what proportion of the full-time student body is enrolled in developmental courses?

	Actual	Ideal
a. Less than 10 percent	___	___
b. Between 10 and 20 percent	___	___
c. Between 20 and 30 percent	___	___
d. Between 30 and 40 percent	___	___
e. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
f. More than 50 percent	___	___

5. How many of these students who begin these courses, or the program, successfully complete it?

	Actual	Ideal
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___

6. How many persist to the second semester in the program or in regular courses?

	Actual	Ideal
a. More than 90 percent	____	____
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	____	____
c. Between 80 and 80 percent	____	____
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	____	____
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	____	____
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	____	____
g. Less than 40 percent	____	____

7. How many persist to the third semester in the program or in regular courses?

	Actual	Ideal
a. More than 90 percent	____	____
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	____	____
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	____	____
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	____	____
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	____	____
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	____	____
g. Less than 40 percent	____	____

8. How many complete on a degree or certificate program?

	Actual	Ideal
a. More than 90 percent	____	____
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	____	____
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	____	____
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	____	____
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	____	____
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	____	____
g. Less than 40 percent	____	____

9. How many, of those who did *not* complete a degree or certificate, transferred to another college or met their own educational objectives?

	Actual	Ideal
a. More than 90 percent	____	____
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	____	____
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	____	____
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	____	____
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	____	____
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	____	____
g. Less than 40 percent	____	____

10. In your opinion do you have a successful developmental/remedial program?

Yes _____ No _____

EVALUATION: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (17)*

Actual Affirmative _____
Ideal Affirmative _____
Difference _____

TOTAL: SELF-SCORING. Number of scorable items (134)*

	Actual Affirmative	Ideal Affirmative	Difference (A - I = D)	Proportion (Totals: SI ÷ D = P)
A. Context				
B. Philosophy				
C. Rationale				
D. Recruitment				
E. Admissions and Placement				
G. Support Services				
Financial Aids				
Learning Assistance Center				
Additional Support Services				
H. Instruction				
I. Staffing				
J. Evaluation				
TOTALS				

K. RESPONDENT

Name: _____

Title: _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"American Schools Are Flunking the Test," American Broadcasting Company, May 27, 1976 (television special).

Adult Functional Competency: A National Study. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

Blocker, Clyde, Plummer, Robert H. and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bloom, B. S. and Others. *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bossone, Richard M. *Remedial English Instruction in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and Evaluation of Current Practices.* Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, September, 1966. (Mimeo.)

Carkhuff, R. R. *Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers.* 2 vols. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Carkhuff, R. R. *The Development of Human Resources.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Clark, Burton R. "The 'Cooling Out' Function in Higher Education." *American Journal of Sociology 65.* May, 1960.

Clark, Burton R. *The Open Door College.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Coleman, James S., *et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Cross, K. Patricia. *Beyond the Open Door.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.

Cross, K. Patricia. *Accent on Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Davis, Junius A., *et al. The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Devirian, M. C., Enright, G. and Smith, G. "Survey of Learning Programs in Higher Education." in *Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference,* 1975.

Eagle, N. "Validity of Student Ratings: A Reaction." *Community and Junior College Journal,* Vol. 46, No. 2, 1975.

Gordon, E. W. *Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education.* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6, 1975.

Gordon, Edmund, *et al.* "Report of the Study of Collegiate Compensatory Programs for Disadvantaged Youth." New York: Columbia University, Unpublished Report, 1972.

"Help for the Brightest." *Time* Magazine. February 2, 1976.

Helling, J. "Participatory Governance — A Losing Model?" *Community and Junior College Journal,* November, 1975.

Jennings, F. G. "The Two-Year Stretch." *Change,* 1970.

Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review,* Winter, 1969, pp. 1-123.

Karabel, J. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." *Educating the Disadvantaged,* edited by E. Flaxman. New York: AMS Press, 1973.

Kendrick, S. A. "College Board Scores and Cultural Bias." *College Board Review,* Winter, 1965, pp. 7-9.

Kipps, Carol. "Progress Report on the First Semester of the Level 1 Program at Compton College." Compton, California: Compton College, 1966. (Mimeo.)

Klein, S., Fenstermacher, G. and Alkin, M. C. "The Center's Changing Evaluation Model." *Evaluation Comment.* U.C.L.A. Center for the Study of Evaluation. January, 1971, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 9-12.

Knoell, D. M. *People Who Need College: A Report on Students We Have Yet To Serve.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1970.

Lanvin, D. E. *The Prediction of Academic Performance.* New York: Russell Sage, 1965.

McKeachie, W. J. "Class Size and Class Influence." *Journal of Psychology 45:* 67-77; 1952.

Mink, Oscar G., Armendariz, J., Shaw, R. and Snow, J. *The Mental Health Associate: Perspective and Promise.* Austin: The University of Texas Hogg Foundation for Mental Health and the Center for Social Work Research, 1976.

Mink, Oscar G. *The Behavior Change Process.* New York: Harper and Company.

Monroe, Charles R. *Profile of the Community College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.

Moore, William, Jr. *The Vertical Ghetto.* New York: Random House, 1969.

Moore, William, Jr. *Against the Odds.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1970.

Moore, William, Jr. *Community College Response to the High-Risk Student: A Critical Reappraisal.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

Moore, William, Jr. "Increasing Learning among Developmental Education Students." in *New Directions for Higher Education: Improving Educational Outcomes.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Northcutt, N., *et al. Adult Functional Competency: A Summary.* Austin, The University of Texas: Division of Extension, 1975.

O'Banion, T. U. "Humanizing Education in the Community College." *Junior College Journal,* 1971, 41.

Pace, C. R. *C.U.E.S.: Preliminary Manual.* Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.

Prediger, D. J. "Predictions of Persistence in College," *Journal of Psychology,* 1965, *12.*

Rector, W. A. Distribution of Group Counselor Scores for the Truax Relationship Questionnaire, *Unpublished Report,* California State University, Chico, 1970.

Richardson, R. C., Blocker, C. E. and Bender, L. W. *Governance for the Two-Year College.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

"Rise in Remedial Work Taxing Colleges." *New York Times,* March 7, 1976.

Rosenthal, R. "Self-Fulfilling Prophecy." *Psychology Today,* 1968.

Roueche, John E. *Salvage, Redirection, or Custody?* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1968.

Roueche, John E. *A Modest Proposal: Students Can Learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.

Roueche, John E. "Accommodating Individual Differences," *Community College Review,* Summer, 1973.

Roueche, John E. "Creating an Environment for Learning," *Community and Junior College Journal.* March, 1976.

Roueche, John E. "Feeling Good about Yourself: What is Good Remedial Education?" *Community College Frontiers,* Winter, 1976.

Roueche, John E. and Mink, Oscar G. "Toward Personhood Development in the Community College," *Community College Review,* Spring, 1976.

Roueche, John E. and Kirk, R. Wade. *Catching Up: Remedial Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Roueche, John E. and Mink, Oscar G. *Improving Student Motivation.* Austin: Sterling Swift Publishing Company, 1976.

Roueche, John E. and Snow, Jerry J. (A new publication, tentative title: *Developmental Education in College: A State of the Art Report)* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Schenz, Robert F. "An Investigation of Junior College Courses and Curricula for Students with Low Ability." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, 1963.

Snow, Jerry, *et al. Tutorial Assistance Program Evaluation.* Austin: The University of Texas, Dean of Students Office, 1975.

Spencer, Thomas. *Reaching for the Ideal.* A Report of the Advisory Council of the Texas Compensatory Education Project. Austin: Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1972.

Stroup, H. *Bureaucracy in Higher Education.* New York: Free Press, 1966.

Tinto, V. *The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention: A Critical Review of the Research.* Columbia University. New York: New York Teachers College, September 11, 1974.

Thornton, James W., Jr. *The Community Junior College* (Second Edition). New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Tolson, H. "Counseling the 'Disadvantaged'," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1972, 50 (9), pp. 735-738.

Truax, C. G. and Carkhuff, R. R. *Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy.* Chicago: Aldine Press, 1967.

United States Department of Commerce. *Detailed Statistics: 1970 Census of the Population.* Washington: Superintendent of Documents.

Wright, E. L. *Student and Instructor Perceptions of Developmental Program Instructors as a Function of Personal Characteristics in Selected Community Colleges in Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin, 1975.

Wylie, R. C. *The Self-Concept.* Second Edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Zucker, Alfred. *An Investigation of Factors Contributing to and Interfering with the Successful Achievement of Remedial English Course Objectives in Los Angeles City Junior Colleges.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, 1966.